DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 379 CE 062 770

AUTHOR	Johnson, Ann; And Others
TITLE	Developing Professionalism in the Child Care Industry. An Instructional Program Guide for Child Care Workers.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Texas State Univ., San Marcos. Center for Initiatives in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	V198A10216
NOTE	121p.; For related documents, see CE 062 769-773.
AVAILABLE FROM	School of Education/Center for Initiatives in Education, Southwest Texas State University, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, TX 78666; or San Marcos Literacy Action, P.O. Box 907, San Marcos, TX 78667.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Associate Degrees; Child Caregivers; *Child Care Occupations; Child Development Specialists; *Classroom Techniques; Community Involvement; *Curriculum Development; Instructional Materials; *Job Skills; Job Training; *Literacy Education; Occupational Home Economics; Program Development; Program Guides; Program Implementation; Reading Skills; School Business Relationship; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

This program guide documents a child care job family curriculum that develops competence in generic work force education skills through two minicourses: Basic Issues in Child Care and Child Development Associate. An annotated table of contents lists a brief description of the questions answered in each section. An introduction presents a program abstract and a guide overview. The remainder of the guide is structured according to the four stages in the process of setting up a work force instructional program: partnership building, curriculum development, actual instruction, and evaluation. A detailed table of contents to each section outlines the steps involved in completing each stage. The section on developing partnerships identifies some key partners and structures for achieving their involvement. The section on developing curriculum describes some structures for assessing and organizing input from a variety of sources. The section on teaching the class presents a curricular model with specific examples of daily classroom activities. The section on assessment and evaluation describes a variety of assessment tools and discusses their advantages and disadvantages. Appendixes include sample lesson plans, evaluation forms, local promotion of the project, and a selected bibliography divided into work force skills (59 items), background theory (47), and practitioner resources (20). (YLB)

ED353379

Developing Professionalism in the Child Care Industry:

an Instructional Program Guide for Child Care Workers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Workforce Instructional Network

CE062770

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Developing Professionalism in the Child Care Industry:

an Instructional Program Guide for Child Care Workers

Ann Johnson, M.S.

Patrice H. Werner, Ph.D.

David C. Caverly, Ph.D.

Series Editor:
David C. Caverly, Ph.D.

Workforce Instructional Network
Center for Initiatives in Education
School of Education
Southwest Texas State University

1992

Contributors to WIN

Stan Ashlock, *Evaluation Assistant*
Mr. Ashlock conducted interviews and observations with workers, teachers, and employers and collected essential information for the outside evaluator. He also helped obtain inter-rater reliability for the qualitative assessment tools and adapted the Daly and Miller Writing Apprehension Scale to a workplace context.

Lisa Bagwell, *Administrative Assistant*
Ms. Bagwell provided administrative assistance such as balancing ledgers, handling correspondence, and purchasing supplies.

Karen Burrell, *Instructor*
Ms. Burrell designed lesson plans and taught courses for the Equipment Operator Job Family. She was responsible for the initial draft of all instructional program guides.

David C. Caverly, *Program Director*
Dr. Caverly initiated the premise of delivering workforce literacy to small businesses in a small city, wrote the grant proposal with assistance from Ms. McBride, and created the WIN Instructional Model. He played a role in the development of the Small Business Literacy Task Analysis, assisted in the development of curricula for all four job familes, presented two staff development workshops, assisted in the staff development activities for the Child Care job family. Moreover, he selected some and developed other assessment instruments for all four job families, wrote the "Assessment and Evaluation" section on all four curriculum guides, and served as General Editor for all four instructional program guides.

Jonathan C. Engel, *Project Director*
Mr. Engel ensured that all grant activities were performed effectively and efficiently. In addition to overall supervision, he formed and chaired the WIN Advisory Council, initiated and developed the multiple partnerships in our instructional network, negotiated consensual approaches to achieve stakeholder buy-in, and led focus groups for the purposes of formative and summative evaluation. Mr. Engel wrote the "Developing Partnerships" section of all the instructional program guides.

Dorcas Garcia, *Limited English Proficiency Specialist*
Ms. Garcia conducted bi-lingual classes with workers of limited English proficiency in the Custodial, Manufacturing , and Equipment Operators Job Families. She also conducted staff training in Spanish.

Ann Johnson, *Instructional Coordinator*
Ms. Johnson designed curricula, developed lesson plans, and taught classes in the Child Care Job Family. As instructional coordinator, she trained, and conducted staff development activities for instructors in that job family. She wrote the "Developing Curriculum" and "Teaching the Class" sections of the instructional program guide for this job family.

Margaret L. Johnson, *Instructor*
Ms. Johnson developed curriculum and lesson plans for the Reading/Writing Improvement course. She taught classes in both the Custodial and Manufacturing Job Families and played a major role in designing the qualitative assessment instruments. She was responsible for the design and layout of all WIN instructional program guides and managed the process of publishing these guides.

Pamela G. McBride, *Instructional Coordinator*
Ms. McBride designed curricula, developed lesson plans, and taught classes in the Custodial, Manufacturing, and Equipment Operator Job Families. She also developed many of WIN's evaluation forms and played a major role in designing the qualitative assessment instruments for these job families. As instructional coordinator, she trained and conducted weekly staff development activities for instructors in the above three job families. She wrote the "Developing Curriculum" and "Teaching the Class" sections of the instructional program guides for those three job families.

Larry Mikulecky, *Outside Evaluator*
Dr. Mikulecky of Indiana University is a nationally recognized expert in the field of workplace literacy. He provided valuable insight to WIN staff at critical junctures during the grant period, serving as external evaluator. In particular, he provided baseline, formative, and summative program evaluation reports.

Joseph Piazza, *Instructor*
Mr. Piazza designed lesson plans and participated in planning and evaluation teams for the Manufacturing Workers Job Family. He also taught classes in the Manufacturing Workers and Equipment Operator Job Families and helped obtain inter-rater reliability for the qualitative assessment instruments.

Erma Thomas, *Instructor Support Specialist*
Ms. Thomas served as a bilingual assistant and substitute instructor in many classes. In addition, she assisted the program by keeping track of registration, attendance, and other student and in-kind support data. She helped obtain inter-rater reliability for the qualitative assessment instruments, and was responsible for compiling, calculating, and verifying a variety of student achievement data for all program guides.

Gayle Slomka, *Instructor*
Ms. Slomka was an instructor in the Basic Issues in Child Care class and gathered qualititative productivity data for the Child Care Job Family.

Patrice Werner, *Curriculum Consultant*
Dr. Werner developed curricula, lesson plans, and assessment instruments and taught classes for the Child Care Job Family. She played a major role in designing the qualitative assessment instruments and conducted a staff training on holistic writing techniques.

Lisa Withrow, *Instructor*
Ms. Withrow was an instructor in the Basic Issues in Child Care class and gathered qualititative productivity data for the Child Care Job Family.

Acknowledgments

WIN would like to thank Margaret E. Dunn, Executive Director, Center for Initiatives in Education and John J. Beck Ed. D., Dean, School of Education, SWTSU for their administrative and moral support as well as their genuine interest in the success of the Workforce Instructional Network.

We would also like to thank the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Marcos, and all of the employers, supervisors, workers, and members of the WIN Advisory Council for their active participation and interest in workforce education in the San Marcos area. Together, we have demonstrated to each other just how important an educated workforce is to the future of our community.

A special thanks to Judy Glover, Director of First Baptist Church Child Development Center; Blye Dollahite, Education Coordinator, Head Start programs of Community Action Inc. of Hays, Caldwell, and Blanco Counties: Susan Porter Smith, Dianne Insley, and Michelle Scott of the San Marcos Public Library.

For more information or additional copies of this guide please contact one of the following:

Dean, School of Education
SWTSU
601 University Drive
San Marcos, TX 78666

Executive Director
Center for Initiatives in Education
SWTSU
601 University Drive
San Marcos, TX 78666

Treasurer, San Marcos Literacy Action
P.O. Box 907
San Marcos, TX 78667

Funds for the development and printing of this publication were provided under Grant V198A10216, National Workplace Literacy Demonstration Grants, U.S. Department of Education

The information presented here is not necessarily endorsed by the State of Texas or the United States Department of Education.

Southwest Texas State University, a member of the Texas State University System, is an affirmative action, equal opportunity educational institution.

© Ann Johnson, Patrice Holden Werner, David C. Caverly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction 2
What is this book about? This section presents an abstract of our program..

Building Partnerships 3
Who should we contact to begin our program? How can we gather ideas from a variety of sources? Effective workforce education programs depend on collaboration from many sources. This section identifies some key partners and structures for achieving their involvement.

Developing Curriculum 18
How do we figure out what classes to offer? What should each class include? How will we identify what workers should be in each class? Input from key stakeholders--including educators, workers, supervisors, managers, and funders--is crucial to creating contextualized, participatory instruction. This section describes some structures for accessing and organizing input from a variety of sources.

Teaching the Class 24
How do we organize so much information into finite classes? What do we do in the classroom each day? Contextualized, participatory instruction can require some flexible strategies from instructors. This section presents a curricular model, with specific examples of daily classroom activities.

Assessment and Evaluation 31
How do we measure progress? Diverse assessment instruments can be used for a number of purposes. This section describes a variety of assessment tools and discusses their advantages and disadvantages.

Appendices 40

Workforce education, as distinguished from job training, emphasizes instruction in learning how to learn because of the swiftly changing nature of the workplace today. Our focus through the Workforce Instructional Network (WIN) was to work with small businesses in a small town to design instruction aimed at improving the literacy skills of individuals currently in the workforce. We accomplished this by forming a partnership between Southwest Texas State University (SWT), the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce, and the San Marcos Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. The success of our project supports the use of a process-oriented education model which emphasizes transferable skills presented in a series of mini-courses from five to fifteen weeks.

In order to develop our curriculum according to an education model, we identified those generic workforce education skills underlying job families rather than concentrating solely on the content knowledge needed for a particular job. Through developing competence with these skills, we hope to have equipped workers for future job changes, many of which cannot even be anticipated in the fast-moving business environment of today. Moreover, these newly developed literacy skills will provide a strong foundation from which the workers can educate themselves given new workforce education demands, resulting in future training savings to the businesses involved. This future efficiency aspect is particularly relevant to small businesses which often rely on on-the-job training by supervisors and co-workers rather than maintaining training staffs.

Building partnerships

Background and context

Write a grant proposal

Learn about the problems of business

Develop a partnership

Implement a community-based workforce education model

Define the mission and connect with partners

Build on existing resources

Reconcile federal priorities with local realities

Develop an on-going communication structure

Demonstrate what for whom

Develop ideas about future support after existing funding

Background and context

The Workforce Instructional Network (WIN) started in May, 1991 through a grant (#V198A10216) at Southwest Texas State University (SWT) from the Office of Adult and Vocational Education, United States Department of Education (USDOE) to establish a National Workplace Literacy Demonstration Project for small businesses. This National Workplace Literacy Project arose out of a concern that the U.S. economy was losing its competitive edge in part because the skills of U.S. workers were deficient relative to those of workers in competing nations. In the national discourse about economic competitiveness and the quality of the American workforce, images of workers in huge automobile and steel plants in urban areas predominated. However, 97% of the nation's towns and cities have populations of less than 50,000 people (*Census Tracts*, 1983). Many of them are like San Marcos, Tx., a community that is characterized by a multitude of small businesses and an educationally disadvantaged workforce. This guide is designed to assist practitioners in designing and implementing workforce education programs for small businesses, particularly child care providers. Since small child care centers rarely budget funds for workforce education activities, the guide will start from the assumption that practitioners will seek grant funds, at least for the start-up phase of their workforce education programs.

Write a grant proposal

We began by approaching a local leadership group of child care providers (the San Marcos Child Care Directors Group) for assistance in conducting a general needs assessment of child care providers in the community. A preliminary questionnaire regarding their training needs was distributed to the members of this group at one of their monthly meetings. Answers on this questionnaire documented that they had a general need for increased employee training in a variety of skills.

To further verify the need for this project community-wide, a needs assessment was completed via personal interviews and phone surveys of 20% of the businesses and industries in the San Marcos community. A broad range of the business community including manufacturing, communication, government, education, retail trade, financial, and child care sectors were contacted. Results of this assessment identified over 600 workers in these twenty businesses alone who were in immediate need of basic literacy skills ranging from reading work order forms and filling out quality control sheets accurately, to basic mathematical computation skills including fractions, decimals, and percentages, to advanced mathematical computation skills up through algebra, to reading safety memos and warning labels on chemicals, to basic computer literacy, word processing, using disk operating systems, spreadsheets, databases, and telecommunications. This information demonstrated to us that business owners perceived a need for workforce literacy education for the San Marcos workforce. Due to this need, the potential of developing workforce literacy education for small businesses, and the partnership that was created, the grant was awarded.

Learn about the problems of business

During these discussions with San Marcos Child Care Directors Group, it was continuously made clear how important it was for us to avoid preconceived notions about their needs and goals. Our early discussions provided a forum where, through active listening, we were able to understand some of the challenges each was facing in an increasingly competitive marketplace. We found these child care providers were often faced with accelerating rates of change and the need to try new ideas, yet the workforce available to them was poorly equipped to learn new processes and adapt to these changes. The child care workplace often requires little, if any, prior training for employment. Further, the low wage and high turnover rate for child care providers does not attract a large pool of highly literate workers. Once employed in a child care center, continuing in-service requirements vary from state to state. In Texas, for example, child care providers are required to have only 15 hours of in-service training annually. Most of this in-service training is not literacy-based, thus not providing child care providers with the strategies to learn about child care on their own. The "content training" nature of these in-services require future training to disseminate more content. The mini-courses offered in this guide are a model for literacy-based child care education for any child care director that perceives the need for a more skilled, literate workforce. Following our curriculum, child care providers will become more literate and thus more empowered to improve themselves.

Develop a partnership

Based on these discussions and the results of the needs assessment, the proposal development team proposed a partnership between Southwest Texas State University, the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce, and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (representing the small businesses including the child care providers). This partnership developed a model for offering effective job-related literacy education for the multiple small businesses that are the mainstay of many local economies. The guiding concept of the proposed model was to develop a community-based approach to workforce education. Clearly, it would not be cost effective or logistically feasible to provide instruction to two or three child care providers at different child care centers across the community. At the same time, it might be difficult for employers to release child care providers to meet at a location in the community.

Our task then was more complicated, or at least different, from *traditional* workforce education programs which are more often partnerships between community colleges and large manufacturers (Chisman, 1992 ; USDOE, 1992). Our strategy was to develop educational programs for job families, rather than specific workplaces. The job families we served were Custodial, Child Care, Manufacturing, and Equipment Operators.

Implement a community-based workforce education model

An initial WIN objective was to raise community awareness about the need for workforce education. The first step was to establish our position and identity within the community. We had to establish *who* we were, *where* we were, and *why* we were there. This step may appear obvious, though our experience indicates that this is not the case. Although representatives from the child care community had been helpful in the proposal development phase, upon funding 12 months later, we had to remind them of who we were and why we were seeking their involvement in the project. At a recent meeting of project directors sponsored by USDOE, similar stories were reported from around the country. It is recommended, therefore, that USDOE streamline its proposal review process. Whether this occurs or not, future projects must consider continually informing partners to anticipate changes in personnel.

Define the mission and connect with partners

Our next step was to (re)define ourselves and our mission to the San Marcos Child Care Directors Group and to convince them to *buy in* to the project. Since our program was of benefit to the their members, but not directly to the group itself, their support was nominal. They agreed to add the responsibility of becoming the WIN Child Care Advisory Council while playing an active role in recruiting child care providers and publicizing our services to local child care centers. This partnership with the San Marcos Child Care Directors Group gave us valuable and needed credibility with area child care providers and facilitated initial negotiations with child care owners and managers who became active participants in the network.

Despite the limited role that the San Marcos Child Care Directors Group played in the construction of WIN, we would recommend involving such organizations in the development of multi-stranded workforce education initiatives which target small businesses. Specifically, we recommend identifying individuals active in such organizations who have a strong interest in workforce education early on in the planning phase. Meet with them to learn as much as you can about the prevailing perceptions of the preparedness of the local workforce. Among other things, they can help you identify specific child care providers who are likely to be receptive to your proposed program.

If possible, also get trade organizations and the local chambers of commerce involved in the development of your workforce education plan. Their involvement early on will strengthen their commitment in the implementation phase as well as the proposal itself, regardless of from whom you are seeking funding (e.g., federal or state agencies, foundations, local resources, and/or the targeted employers).

Working with the Child Care Directors Group, chambers of commerce, and other trade organizations is particularly critical to the success of community-based approaches to literacy development. Such organizations are instrumental in the development of the local economic development strategy, and the quality of the local workforce is always a critical component of any such strategy. Let them know you are capable of enhancing the skills of local child care providers and, with them, determine which sectors of the local workforce are currently considered most critical to the economic vitality and quality of life of your community.

The position the WIN staff decided to establish was that of a community-based workforce education initiative which would raise awareness of the need for job-related literacy instruction across the private and public sectors and concentrate the knowledge and resources of multiple employers, employees, educators, and community representatives on the problem of workforce and community development. From the onset, WIN staff advocated the development of literacy programs that would be flexible enough to meet the needs of multiple workplaces. This was important to establish because it was not cost effective to customize workplace instruction for a particular small workplace that might only have two or three child care providers who would participate. Furthermore, the WIN staff wanted to demonstrate that workplace instruction could be contextualized to a set of proficiencies common to a particular job family rather than a particular workplace. Such an approach was the foundation of our model of workforce education for small businesses and should be of critical interest to other literacy practitioners interested in working with small businesses.

Build on existing resources

A second and equally important reason for choosing a community-based approach to workforce education was the existence of a strong community-based literacy initiative already in San Marcos with which most of the WIN staff had been associated previous to implementation of this project. Building upon existing resources strengthens the community effort and minimizes duplication. San Marcos is a community that has a significant adult literacy problem.

Several organizations were addressing this problem prior to the establishment of the WIN project. The San Marcos Public Library has a very active literacy and General Educational Development (G.E.D.) degree preparation program in place. In addition, various community agencies had combined efforts and resources to establish a family literacy program in a public housing complex and to enhance existing programs in order to meet the requirements of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients authorized by the Family Support Act of 1988. The Program Director with one of the Instructional Coordinators had developed a general workforce education class for custodians working in the Physical Plant at the university. In addition, the Educational Council of the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce (itself a community-based organization) had supported the establishment of a local literacy council. This culminated in the formation of San Marcos Literacy Action (SMLA), a community-based organization dedicated to overcoming functional illiteracy.

In short, given WIN's objective of establishing effective literacy programs for multiple small employers and in the context of existing literacy initiatives, it was evident that the WIN staff should extend the pre-existing community-based model to meet the needs of local employers and to establish a public/private sector initiative aimed at overcoming functional illiteracy in the workplace *as well as* in the community. The primary vehicles for accomplishing this community-wide effort toward workforce literacy and economic development were the WIN Advisory Council and San Marcos Literacy Action. These groups had overlapping memberships and complementary missions. Expressed in terms of raising community awareness, a primary WIN public relations theme was developed: ***Workforce development always equals economic development.*** In complement, the primary theme of SMLA was an educated workforce (which includes the unemployed and under-employed) which can enhance the quality of life in the community and the development of effective and accessible literacy programs as an investment in the future. As in most communities, business leaders and citizens are deeply concerned about the quality of public education, and it was therefore of value to emphasize that child care providers are also parents, and their participation in literacy programs will enhance their capability to be involved in their children's education. This community-wide effort was possible due to the small city context for our workforce literacy education. If you replicate these mini-courses in another small town or city, we would recommend you also develop a community wide effort at workforce and general literacy development.

While WIN believes that it made the right choice in choosing a community-based approach to workforce education in San Marcos, we do not necessarily believe that it is the only approach to workforce education initiatives that target multiple small employers. Rather, we recommend that practitioners carefully analyze the context in which they intend to operate and choose their approach based on that analysis. A significant factor in your analysis should be demographics. For example, you may choose to operate in a community larger than San Marcos that has a large number of child care centers. In such a context, a community-based approach to workforce education may well be too ambitious. You would probably have great difficulty galvanizing the interest of enough key players in the community to make it worth your effort. It is important to be cognizant of the diverse problems, challenges, and opportunities that make up community life. The larger the community, the more diverse, and the more likely that certain sectors of the community will take ownership of certain issues and other sectors will do the same with other issues. A promising strategy for developing programs for small employers in a medium-sized or large city might be to target a particular trade or job family and initiate a partnership with the employer trade organization and/or the labor union to which the majority of employees belong.

In economic terms where there is a greater division of labor, a greater division of literacy programs for labor is probably desirable. For example, a large high-tech company may want one basic skills program for its chip manufacturing division and another one for its hardware assembly workers. (It is important to note that major components of two such programs could be, and probably should be, the same.) In a small community characterized by small employers like San Marcos, the division of labor occurs at the level of the individual business, each needing labor for one or two product lines of customer services. The division of labor is to some degree community-based and therefore we chose a community-based response.

Literacy in San Marcos-- Preliminary Statistical Summary

City of San Marcos (1990 Census)

Total population	White	Hispanic	Black
28,473	22,527 (79%)	10,571(37%)	1,535(.05%)

Note: Totals do not equal 100% because many residents identified themselves as both white and Hispanic

According to 1980 census and recent SMCISD surveys 46% of the adults over the age of 25 do not have a high school diploma. This represents approximately 11,000 people.

San Marcos Consolidated School District

Total population	Anglo	Hispanic	Black
6,000 +	34%	63%	2.5%

SMCISD statistic: The San Marcos High School class of 1990 entered the ninth grade with 562 students. It entered the twelfth grade with 337: 40 % of the freshmen did not make it to the beginning of their senior year. Of that 40%, 77% were Hispanic. Statistics for how many students dropped out in the twelfth grade are not available at this time. Nor are statistics available on the number of students who did not enter the ninth grade.

Adult and Family Literacy Programs in San Marcos

Total Population		Hispanic	Other
Adult:	1,250	86%	14%
Children:	@120	79 children attended Project PLUS last year 30-40 children attend ROOTS program at Jackson Chapel	

Note: These statistics do not include local adults who have attend programs at Gary Job Corps, Rural Capital Area Private Industry Council, the PRIDE Center (@70 students), or the Hays County Law Enforcement Center.

1,250 adults (.5% of the voting age population) put in a minimum of 36,000 hours of participation in area literacy programs.

Conclusion: There are at least 10,000 adults out there without a high school diploma and many more that are functionally illiterate.

Reconcile federal priorities with local realities

Since many workforce education programs for small businesses are likely to be grant funded, practitioners must reconcile the funding agencies priorities to local realities. In the case of the National Workplace Literacy Demonstration Program (NWLD), USDOE strongly urged practitioners to: 1) obtain at least a 30% in-kind and/or financial contribution from their partners; 2) link instruction to the literacy requirements of actual jobs; and 3) measure the impact of literacy instruction on worker productivity.

While the WIN staff supported all of the above priorities, it was a challenge reconciling each of them with local workplace realities. In its literacy program for child care providers, it was quickly established that most child care centers simply could not afford to contribute to the project. Parent fees for child care are the major source of revenue for most child care programs. These fees are usually able to support minimum wage salaries for employees with little or no provision for employee benefits. Child care directors and owners would provide more for their employees if their resources would allow it. However, increasing fees is unrealistic for most parents. Therefore, child care owners and directors offer the best they can under difficult circumstances. Because of the minimum wage structure, a highly literate, trained staff is rare within a given child care center.

Both center directors and child care providers were eager to participate, and the WIN staff decided it had an obligation to serve child care providers, despite their inability to pay. (Fortunately, in USDOE terminology, the child care providers are referred to as sites, not partners.) Therefore, WIN was not out of compliance with USDOE. Unfortunately, it is clear that the great majority of child care centers in the country can not afford to be a partner in NWLD projects. For more information concerning USDOE definitions, please see the Federal Register, August 18, 1989, page 34419.

Linking instruction to the literacy requirement of the actual workplace for child care providers also proved rather problematic. Most child care providers coveted additional information in the education of young children, but their prior experiences biased them to think this could only be received through training in a short, half-day in-service (see above). We had to convince both the child care owners and directors as well as the child care providers of the need for educating them in workforce literacy skills so they might continue learning beyond the formal instruction.

Measuring the impact of literacy on productivity was the most challenging of all. We approached increasing productivity by arguing that increased literacy skills for child care providers would have an impact not only on the child care providers themselves, but also on the quality of experience that children receive in each center. Well informed, trained child care providers are among the predictors of quality in child care (Copple, 1991). Furthermore, a positive effect is found for society as the effects of quality early childhood experiences for children reduces grade retention and special education placement for children in elementary school and helps children develop social competencies needed for school success (Murphy & Waxler, 1989). Finally, there is an additional effect on the consumers in the child care business (i.e., parents) where parents come to their workplace with lessened anxiety concerning their child's care arrangements. It has been indicated in recent studies that child care concerns cause more problems in the workplace than anything else (Texas Employment Commission, 1992). Therefore, we directly measured the changes in child care environment and the changes in the child care providers' verbal interaction with children as measures of increased productivity (see below).

Developing an on-going communication structure

In addition to providing credibility as a provider of educational services, working with an umbrella group such as the San Marcos Child Care Directors Group proved to be a useful structure for establishing communication with the child care community. In the early stages of our project we made contact with potential child care clients through presentations to this group. These meetings provided an excellent forum for informing the child care community about the importance of continuing workforce education and how it can benefit them and their community. Just as we, as educators, needed to learn about the needs of child care providers, so did the child care business leaders need to understand our educational philosophy regarding education versus training in order to develop effective partnerships in the area of workforce education. Presentations of the advantages of a workforce education program along with a needs assessments were given at a monthly child care directors meeting. The Child Care Instructional Coordinator from WIN continued to meet with the directors at future meetings for the duration of our grant. This insured a flow of information for each specific class as well as the more global feedback gained from the Child Care Advisory Board.

To foster the communication for child care providers needs, we developed the WIN Child Care Advisory Council which consisted of representative child care directors, child care providers, parents with children in child care, and workforce education instructors. This Advisory Council met approximately every other month discussing the WIN child care mini-courses and larger issues in early childhood education and care. For example, child advocacy and community support were discussed which resulted in a visit by a state representative that serves on the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth. At the conclusion of the grant cycle, the Advisory Council decided to continue to meet to address the identified concerns and to become the task force addressing the AMERICA 2000 National Educational Goal #1: Ready to Learn.

Another reason for the importance of continuous communication with the child care community is to facilitate the development of curriculum designed to appropriately meet not only our educational criteria, but the child care providers' needs. Always crucial in workforce education, this becomes even more complex when working with many small child care centers, each having individual yet common needs.

By concentrating on developing curriculum based on workforce education tasks rather than workplace specific job content, the instruction was made flexible enough to meet the needs of participants from several child care centers. For example, the Child Development Associate (CDA) class provided writing process experiences with the subject areas related to child care. The class consisted of modeling and practicing writing process strategies in order for participants to develop the skills necessary to independently complete the writing requirements for the CDA credential.

This focus on workforce education tasks rather than individual job content was immediately transferable for the child care providers in several ways. In the case of these classes, the literacy tasks were made applicable to decision-making in their own parenting skills, problem-solving in their own classroom, and support for enhancing their own continuing education.

We also developed a general, community-based WIN Advisory Council for all the job families. This served as the forum to discuss workforce education on the global, national and local levels. We began by informing the WIN Advisory Council about federal priorities. We sought their assessment of local realities in specific relation to those priorities. We shared the program evaluation objectives stated in our proposal with the Council and elicited their advice.

The construction of a community-based WIN Advisory Council involved two distinct processes. One was the creation of a forum which sought community input and promoted a cross-fertilization of ideas and strategies that centered around the educational needs of the local workforce as viewed from diverse perspectives. The other was the creation of a mechanism for implementing actual programs. To initiate the first process, representatives from across the community were invited to monthly meetings over the lunch hour. In addition to employers who were active WIN partners, we invited literacy professionals, elected officials, representatives from employers not participating in WIN programs, members from boards of community organizations, university professors, workforce education students, students from other literacy programs, floor supervisors, school district representatives, etc. The purpose of this approach was threefold: a) to raise community awareness about the need for workforce education instruction; b) to create a forum where the purposes and methods could be openly discussed; and c) to build community buy-in for WIN objectives.

At the first meetings, the WIN staff introduced the USDOE National Workplace Demonstration Program and attempted to explain it in global, national, and local contexts. Studies and reports such as *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages*, The *Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills* (1991, June), pertinent articles from Business Council for Effective Literacy, *MOSAIC*, and other newsletters were disseminated and referenced so that Council members could view the WIN project as part of a broader context or movement. In addition, the Advisory Council was utilized as a forum to discuss the salient differences between job-related functional context education and other more traditional literacy instruction (e.g., library based one-on-one tutoring, English as a Second Language, G.E.D., etc.). This stimulated thought and discussion among employer representatives about what they wanted their employees to learn and why. Did they want to link learning to the skill requirements of actual jobs? Did they want child care providers to learn content or to learn how to learn? Similar questions should be discussed in your advisory council meetings.

We found through these discussions a cross fertilization of ideas began to take place. It turned out that employer representatives from two high-tech companies new to San Marcos had extensive experience in basic skills programs in workplace contexts and were doing similar training for their companies. These companies had already committed to their own brand of Total Quality Management. When they moved to our town, they set high minimum skill standards for entry-level jobs. Therefore, they did not need WIN services. However, their representatives brought quality experiences and insights to the Advisory Council. In discussions of general literacy versus job-related literacy in specific contexts, they were able to make insightful comments based on their experiences. If WIN had limited the Advisory Council to only participant workplaces, this source of expertise would not have been available.

The second process for developing the Advisory Council evolved after WIN had implemented programs for each of the job families. The Advisory Council began to take a broader view of the issue of workforce development in the community. Toward the end of the grant cycle, the Advisory Council sponsored a workforce development focus group, primarily as a means to assess where to go from here without the support of the USDOE. Employer representatives reported they had difficulty finding qualified applicants, even for low-skill jobs. One truly startling revelation that arose out of this discussion was that every employer in the room admitted that most of their skilled employees lived outside the San Marcos community. If higher paid skilled employees live outside the community, they are likely to spend their paychecks elsewhere. The WIN staff used the implications for the local economy to serve as a galvanizing issue to build local support for linking literacy education to actual jobs after the funding period.

The establishment of the WIN Advisory Council was a critical mechanism in the provision of a community base to the Workforce Instructional Network. It created a forum where people could explore the nature of the link between literacy and a good job. It provided a forum for the WIN staff to develop and refine its marketing premise: workforce development equals economic development and enhanced quality of life. Finally, it planted the seed for a private/public sector initiative to develop the local workforce through literacy.

Realities of a Participatory Approach

Based on our experience, WIN recommends the participatory approach to those developing workforce education for small businesses. However, practitioners need to be sensitive to the contexts they are working in and flexible in the development of effective workforce education program.

Early on in our project, WIN staff discovered first hand how a program can be compromised by not informing all stakeholders of your purpose from the outset. An employer approached the WIN staff about the provision of Commercial Drivers License (CDL) instruction to its drivers. In the negotiation phase, the Human Resources Department assured the project director that all arrangements had been made for the mini-courses to begin.

A meeting was scheduled with the plant supervisors, and it was as if they had never heard of WIN. These supervisors had very strong opinions about how the CDL program should be implemented. First, they believed that the employer should provide full release time to workers studying for their CDL test because the new licensing was required by law. The employer had proposed a 50 % time share. Second, the supervisors believed the worker should pay for it because they would have the right to take it with them to a new employer. The employer had proposed that it pay for the cost of the CDL license. These issues were resolved at a meeting between supervisors, human resources personnel, and the WIN staff, but a negative and combative tone had been established. Other difficult issues quickly arose concerning confidentiality of the needs assessment process: a critical issue due to the large number of Limited English Proficient drivers who needed to prepare for the exam orally in Spanish. Finally, there was a philosophical difference between WIN instructors and the supervisors on how instruction was to take place. Supervisors advocated a quick intensive training approach to achieve the discrete goal of the CDL license. WIN instructors preferred a "learning how to learn" approach with mini-courses to be held four hours per week for five weeks. The WIN objective was for workers to complete the CDL class with the knowledge of how to prepare themselves for any job-related certification which required the studying of a manual in order to pass an examination.

All of these problems and differences were worked out, and the mini-courses were taught according to the WIN instructional model. However, there was no mutually agreed upon mechanism for addressing the issues, and unnecessary tension was created. Extensive damage control was required. If the WIN staff had initiated the partnership utilizing the participatory model described above, these issues and differences would likely have surfaced early on and would have been efficiently and effectively addressed in a far more agreeable fashion.

Demonstrate what for whom

Demonstration projects are designed to identify instructional strategies that are replicable in a wide variety of situations and for a wide variety of audiences. In fact, the purpose of this guide is to help you find effective strategies to implement a workforce education program in your child care center or community. However, we recognize each child care center and community exists in a unique context, and it is usually necessary to customize your program to that context. In San Marcos, we found it useful to ask the following questions: Demonstrate what for whom? After some discussion and an in-service staff workshop, the WIN staff reached the following conclusions for our workplace context. First, we needed to demonstrate to local child care providers and employers that participation in the WIN project can make a positive difference in the way work is accomplished, however measured. Second, we needed to identify what worked best and recommend it as a promising approach to practitioners who are implementing workforce literacy projects with these job families.

This was a good first step, but the federal priorities-local realities dilemma was difficult, particularly as it relates to program evaluation issues. In our discussions with local employers other than child care centers, we sometimes encountered an aversion to government intrusion into their affairs. It is important to account for this possibility when you initiate discussions. The box below describes WIN's encounter with one such employer.

Federal Priorities and Local Realities: You Can't Get There from Here

In the fall of 1991, WIN initiated its first Math for Manufacturing class. The partner company manufactures heat tracing products, usually involving insulated electric wire, for the application of heat to piping, tanks, instrumentation and other types of equipment. Headquartered in San Marcos, the company is competitive on the world market in its niche and has manufacturing and engineering offices in eight countries around the world. The San Marcos plant, the company's largest, employs 220 people, about 50 of whom work in what is called the wire plant. Hearing about the services of the Workforce Instructional Network at a presentation made by the Project Director to the San Marcos Manufacturing Association, the Vice President of Operations called WIN and said he was interested. Negotiations on how the program would be implemented began.

At about the same time, the project's outside evaluator, visited WIN to gather data for his baseline evaluation. He spent a good deal of time talking to project staff about the importance of program evaluation and the need for accountability. He reminded staff that we had proposed to USDOE that we would quantitatively and qualitatively assess learner gain in job-related literacy as well as develop productivity measures. Due to the evaluator's comments, federal priorities were in the forefront of our minds during the negotiation phase. The vice-president listened politely as the project director told him the things we would need to do to satisfy our commitment to USDOE. In addition, the project director sent a WIN staff member to interview the vice-president in order to collect some baseline data for the outside evaluator.

The vice president appeared accepting of it all, and we proceeded to develop an effective and exciting class for 15 of the company's wire plant workers; all but one of whom were women of Mexican and Mexican American origin. In order to gather some data on productivity, the project director met with the Wire Plant Supervisor in order to devise a productivity related supervisor rating scale. In that meeting the project director made some mention of USDOE or the federal government. The Wire Plant Supervisor quickly said, "You better be careful talking about the government with Mr._________ (the Vice President). And if you need anything from him, you better ask me to get it for you. He's pretty steamed about the government wanting this and that around here." Well, this was all news to the project director. The supervisor went on to say that the vice president had said, "You know, if I had known those guys were gonna want so much damn other stuff, I would have just hired a Math teacher from the high school."

The class was a success by every measure, pre- and post- tests, supervisor ratings, and participant observations. After it was over, the project director asked if the company would be interested in developing an intermediate Math class. He was told that the company was just about to enter its busiest part of the year and to contact the company in the Spring. The project director did so. He talked to the Plant Supervisor twice and the Vice President once. There was always something that prevented us from getting another class going. The Project Director suspects that the real reason has to do with the problem of reconciling federal priorities with local realities. Yet the class was a success, and the wire plant workers and supervisors still need and want more math instruction. Only time will tell if WIN or some other literacy initiative will be welcome back to the wire plant.

Develop ideas about future support after existing funding

Near the beginning of your effort, discuss possible ways that the business community could support an ongoing program of workforce education. In the case of small businesses, we found operating through the Chambers of Commerce and the San Marcos Child Care Directors Group gave us credibility with the business owners and managers. Such umbrella groups also function as an institution to support continuing programs. In our discussions, we argued even though our project was grant-funded with a definite conclusion, there is still an unmet need for a steady program of workforce education in San Marcos. In addition, increasing the pool of job-ready applicants would benefit the child care community.

At the conclusion of our grant-funding cycle, together, we were able to find support to continue the mini-courses for child care providers. The support was not from the child care businesses directly, due to the financial constraints discussed above, but was, we believe, due to our successful curriculum. The funding came from one child care director who was able to solicit state funds to provide our curriculum to more child care providers. Even though this funding adheres to a specific funding cycle, these resources are renewable. Therefore, the promise of ongoing workforce literacy education for child care providers in this community is optimistic.

Developing curriculum

Develop workforce literacy curriculum around generic literacy strategies

Gather information to develop curriculum

Complete interviews with management

Interview child care provider

Observe the child care providers on-the-job

Develop a curriculum based upon needs assessment

Establish the logistics of the class

Ensure confidential reporting procedures

Negotiate contract with child care provider

Screen with context-relevant task

Provide in-service for staff development

Develop workforce literacy curriculum around generic literacy strategies

We chose to design our curriculum to appropriately meet not only our educational criteria but child care providers' needs. Always crucial in workforce education, meeting these needs became more complex when working with several small child care centers, each having individual yet common needs. By concentrating on educating the child care providers in generic workforce literacy strategies rather than training for specific job content, the instruction was made flexible enough to meet the needs of child care providers from several child care centers. In both mini-courses we had child care providers attend who worked for church-related, private, university-related, and self-employed child care providers. Literacy instruction centered around reading strategies for accessing resources to answer job-specific questions, and then synthesizing the answers into writing projects in order to share the information with others. These generic workforce education strategies served to meet the needs of the child care centers by providing workforce literate child care providers able to address many literacy demands. It further served the child care providers by providing a model for functional reading and writing.

The focus on educating for generic workforce education strategies rather than training for individual job skills also enhanced the transferability of the learning in several ways. We expect the generic literacy strategies to be helpful in a variety of future job advancement options. In addition, the generic workforce education strategies focus also enabled some child care providers to develop applications of these skills into their personal lives. For example, anecdotal evidence revealed that several child care providers gained the confidence and incentive to read books that had been sitting on home shelves for quite some time. Others noted the applicability of the reading and writing strategies to achieving success in college. Several child care providers even expressed an interest in applying for admission to the local university. These changing personal goals can be considered strong evidence of an increased self-confidence in our child care providers' literacy ability for any environment.

> *"Since I have raised all my own children, I thought I was too old to learn anything new. Now, since I am working to get my CDA credential, I found out that I can learn something new."*
> *--CDA Credential Student*

Gather information to develop curriculum

An effective means for determining the educational needs of the child care providers you hope to serve is a Literacy Task Analysis. Descriptions of the formal process can be found elsewhere (Drew & Mikulecky, 1988). We found we needed to modify this process to work with child care providers while retaining the three main points of triangulation: interviews, materials inspection, and job observation. This needs assessment served the purpose of looking at each worker's job from several viewpoints in order to get a clear picture of the literacy demands involved in that worker's job.

Complete interview with management

In the child care centers we served we found there was essentially no middle management. Most centers had a director who also served as the immediate supervisor of the child care providers. Other centers hired an assistant director to help with scheduling, paper work, and some classroom related tasks. Talking with child care directors was for the most part sufficient to address management's perspective on the literacy tasks. Directors contributed information about the problems of actually accomplishing their goals for their program and identified child care providers that could be observed on the job. This lack of middle management was viewed as a benefit to implementing our program. Communication was easily facilitated and decisions were readily made.

Interview child care providers

Additional information was gathered from child care providers during interviews. Their perceptions of the literacy demands of their job were noted and verified. We also gathered some materials which child care providers were expected to use when doing a particular job as well as general materials such as lesson plans, parent communications, and communications from child care directors to the child care providers. These materials proved useful when developing the curriculum.

We found no lack of available materials for child care providers to apply literacy skills. Child care directors often had an abundance of child care resources. However, the child care providers often did not take advantage of these resources for various reasons. Child care providers stated that they found it difficult, when they have no paid planning time, to find the time to access the resources. Other providers expressed a lack of confidence in their ability to read and understand the content. To maximize the amount of child care resources available for the child care providers involved in our classes, resources were pooled from the participating centers. The local public library provided shelf space available for those participating in our program.

Observe the child care providers on-the-job

The third point of the triangulation was actual job observation. This gave us, as educators, a context for the information gained in the interviews and provoked further clarifying questions. In addition, this helped avoid misunderstandings on the nature of the job which would not be uncovered in an interview-only approach. Employees often did not realize the extent of the various literacy tasks required by their jobs nor did they identify them as such. For example, since the *reading-to-do* found on a job was different from the *reading-to-learn* remembered from school days (Mikulecky & Diehl, 1980) many child care providers said they didn't read on-the-job, whereas observation provided more accurate data on the frequency of their actual job-related interactions with print.

Develop a curriculum based upon needs assessment

The curriculum was considered the road to our instructional goal. Therefore, based upon the needs assessment, we identified the basic topics, a sequence for the topics, materials and handouts to be used, and pre-tests and post-tests before beginning the class.

Establish the logistics of the class

Educators who are used to working in an established educational institution often do not have to think of some of the logistics associated with developing a class. However, workforce education often requires a more entrepreneurial approach by the educator. Such things as finding a place to teach, discovering a source for overhead projectors and blackboards, and arranging for copying services must be done. The classes for the child care providers were held in a church building which housed a child care center. The director of this particular center encouraged her child care providers to participate in all of our child care classes. We also held classes in the public library. These in-kind contributions of space significantly reduced our operating costs. Also, teaching the classes at a "non-academic" location helped to facilitate non-threatening atmosphere.

Ensure confidential reporting procedures

Confidentiality was also an issue. We found it very important that the child care providers feel comfortable during the learning process. This was especially true of our child care providers whose past educational experiences had been negative. They needed to know that the inevitable mistakes they make while learning would not have a negative effect on their job ratings. To ensure this confidentiality as learners, we negotiated agreements with all employers to provide learner progress reports either in the aggregate or individually with randomly-assigned numbers, rather than names of child care providers.

Negotiate contract with child care centers

The WIN Project Director negotiated a learning contract with the child care centers for both the program and the individual child care providers. One aspect of this agreement is the incentives which are used to encourage child care providers to attend and the various ways they need to demonstrate their commitment. Providing release time was difficult for most child care centers, but our child care providers demonstrated a high level of professionalism and self-motivation. In order to allow for release time during regular working hours substitutes would have to be hired. Therefore, most of the classes were held during a weekday evening. Two centers, however, were able to provide release time for their staff during weekday afternoons. It is important to note the particular circumstances that allowed this to happen so that in the future other programs might encourage it. One center was a Head Start program (which receives federal funds specifically for staff training) and the other center was affiliated with a university that allowed for college students to cover for the child care providers during their release time. Except for these two instances, the providers attending classes did so on their own time with no compensation. The employees demonstrated their commitment by regular attendance and by doing the necessary studying outside of class on their own time.

Child care providers in state-licensed centers are required by our state to complete 15 hours of training annually. We made arrangements with the state licensing agency for the classes offered through the WIN program to fulfill these requirements. One center director, therefore, was able to compensate her staff for the 15 hours of required training. However, since our classes were longer than 15 hours, the child care providers were not paid for this additional time. It is to their credit that most felt the classes were of such value that they continued to attend even when they were not being paid.

Screen with context-relevant task

Traditional screening of possible participants in the child care classes was not done. All interested child care providers were placed in the mini-course of their choice, although some realized the need for the *Basic Issues in Child Care (Basic Issues)* mini-course prior to the *Child Development Associate (CDA)* mini-course. The providers were recruited from two sources: 1) publicity given to all child care directors in the community; and 2) from advertisement of classes in the local newspaper. The *Basic Issues* mini-course was considered an entry-level class while the *CDA* mini-course was encouraged for those with more experience in child care.

Provide in-service for staff development

In order to deliver instruction to child care providers, the question arose whether the instructor should be a literacy expert (process-oriented) or a child care expert (content-oriented). In our curriculum development, a joint effort was made between a child care expert and a literacy expert. Classes were taught by the child care expert with the focus on the process of learning how to learn rather than a lecture on content. We planned the *Basic Issues* and *CDA* mini-courses to be successfully taught by a literacy expert with little or no prior experience with child care. However, we recommend to set up a collaboration with an early childhood expert from a local community college or some local child care professional organization.

A useful addition to our course development was the provision of staff development workshops. Most of our staff had not worked in workforce education environments, had little experience with qualitative and quantitative assessment, and had virtually no experience with the WIN Instructional Model (see below). We solicited consultants from the field at large as well as from SWT to deliver three workshops. Outside consultants were hired to provide a two-day workshop to help us corroborate our priorities to demonstrate what for whom. This two-day workshop was extremely fruitful in evaluating these priorities and document what information needed to go to whom. Two half-day workshops were given by the Program Director on the WIN Instructional Model as well as administration and scoring of the cloze instrument. For the novice instructors, these proved useful. In addition, the Child Care Instructional Coordinator along with the Program Director held weekly staff meetings where instructional issues were discussed, pedagogical strategies confirmed, and problems resolved.

To foster transfer for novice instructors, a novice instructor sat in the mini-course for every class to observe and act as teacher's aide. For the next iteration of the mini-course, the novice instructor taught the course. This transfer of responsibility for instruction proved successful as performance varied little from those mini-courses taught by the Child Care Instructional Coordinator and those taught by novice instructors. We would, therefore, recommend you solicit consultants for staff development in curriculum development, the WIN Instructional Model, as well as qualitative and quantitative assessment.

Teaching the Class

Teach process not content

Teach the Basic Issues mini-course

Teach the CDA mini-course

Use of WIN four-part instructional model

Initiating event

Modeling and large group discussion

Guided practice

Individual practice

Graduation ceremony

Teach process not content

Child care providers had a strong desire to improve their literacy skills, both for personal growth and for job advancement. Management had a consistent desire. Courses were devised, therefore, which emphasized expanding reading and writing strategies applicable to general literacy as well as future workforce literacy demands.

We decided to offer two mini-courses for the child care job family: 1) *Basic Issues* and 2) *CDA*. The *Basic Issues* mini-course was designed to develop reading strategies necessary to gather information to improve job effectiveness. The *CDA* mini-course was designed to develop writing process skills necessary to complete a portfolio for the Child Development Associate credential. Although the *Basic Issues* mini-course was not a prerequisite for the *CDA* mini-course, many workers chose to complete both mini-courses in that sequence.

Although the content of the courses varied, a main topic addressed in each course was the instructional *process* of teaching child care providers how to learn independently. Child care providers were expected and guided to contribute greatly to the pacing and presentation of ideas (see WIN Instructional Model below). This method of teaching surprised many of the child care providers who, following the traditional model, initially expected the mini-course to consist largely of lectures on specific content areas. Other aspects of the instructional model detailed below contributed to a consistent effort to model and practice the *process* of independent, holistic learning by using the *content* derived from literature on quality child care.

Classes were held weekly for 2 hours each session. The mini-course length varied from 10 to 15 weeks depending on the number of identified literacy tasks. Completing the writing tasks in the *CDA* mini-course required more time than the reading tasks in the *Basic Issues* mini-course. We felt that a weekly mini-course spread out over several weeks in the form of a mini-course gave the workers the time needed to practice and refine their use of the techniques from the class at home and on the job. The usual Saturday in-service or traditional training would not have permitted this guided growth process.

Teach the Basic Issues mini-course

The *Basic Issues* mini-course was designed for child care providers that had limited educational background in issues relating to child care and/or experience working with young children. As was stated earlier, there is no lack of relevant materials from which to apply literacy skills. However, for the most part, our child care providers were not aware of the resources available to them. Even when child care center directors made information available, providers often did not feel confident in their abilities to read and understand the content of such material. Therefore, this mini-course was designed to develop student reading strategies in work-related materials. This 10 week mini-course met 2 hours each week during a weekday evening.

The materials for this mini-course were gathered from easily accessible child care journals: ***Texas Child Care*** (a publication distributed to all state-licensed child care centers in Texas), ***Dimensions*** (a publication distributed to members of the Southern Association on Children Under Six) and ***Young Children*** (a publication from the National Association for the Education of Young Children). The last two publications are found in most child care centers where the director is a member of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the largest professional association for early childhood professionals. Copyright permission was obtained from the editors of the journals and copies of articles served as the text for the mini-course (see Appendix A for a list of the articles)

The particular articles were chosen for their relevance to issues raised during needs assessment observations. Both directors and providers expressed a need to be better able to respond to children appropriately in terms of classroom behavior management. To adequately address the complexity of children's behavior, the issues were chosen to guide the child care providers in reading material that would further their background and understanding in guiding, teaching, and caring for children. Detailed information about the reading strategies and literacy skill developed can be found in the lesson plans found in Appendix A.

Teach the CDA mini-course

The *CDA* mini-course was designed for child care providers that had more experience working in child care settings. Participants came from the *Basic Issues* mini-course and from centers where directors were committed to increased professionalism in their staff. Providers were also motivated to complete the credential as it is recognized by the Texas Department of Human Services as a career advancement step. In Texas, this credential allows for child care providers to be directors of child care programs.

The materials for this mini-course were CDA Competency Standards materials and *Essentials*, a textbook written by the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition for Child Development Associates. The *Essentials* text complimented the instructional approach of the WIN as its design was more of a workbook requiring a participatory approach by the reader.

> *Concerning the CDA Essentials book, "This book is really good. It gives you ideas of what to think about."*
> *--CDA Credential Student*

The course was originally designed for 9 weeks, meeting two hours weekly. It was found that more time was needed to complete the goals set by the child care providers. Four more weeks (8 hours) of mini-course time was added to meet these needs. Child care providers were also motivated by the fact that the fee to complete the credential was scheduled to increase during the delivery of the course. There is federal funding available based on income guidelines to cover the CDA credential fee (currently $325). Some of the child care providers exceeded the income guidelines and had to pay for the credential from their own resources. This cost became a major barrier for a number of child care providers as they considered completing the CDA credential.

Space for offering the mini-course was provided by one of the centers that had child care providers participating in the mini-course. Detailed information about the writing strategies and literacy skill development can be found in the lesson plans found in Appendix A.

Use of the WIN four-part instructional model

A process-oriented educational philosophy formed the basis for our four-part instructional model (Caverly, Burrell, Austin, & Wedig, 1992). The first step in this model involved an initiating event which engaged the prior knowledge of the child care providers who were considered the content knowledge experts for their jobs. Next, the instructor modeled literacy strategies, using a large group discussion format for accomplishing those literacy tasks we were able to identify via the needs assessment. Small groups then collaborated on workplace-related literacy tasks which required the use of these new strategies. This small group emphasis developed the communication and teamwork skills which are sought by employers, while at the same time developing child care providers' strategies for accomplishing the workforce education tasks. Finally, learners worked to apply their new understandings during independent practice on workplace and home-related literacy tasks.

WIN Instructional Model

Initiating event/focusing activity

- engages prior knowledge
- builds on learner strengths
- demonstrates relevance/connection of new knowledge to old knowledge

Teacher modeling/large group discussion

- uses master/apprentice conception of literacy
- demonstrates metacognitive strategies
- validates a variety of strategies from students

Small group collaborative practice/application

- encourages a community of teachers/learners
- gives learners opportunity to develop teamwork skills being emphasized by business
- safe risk-taking environment, especially for LEP students

Individual practice/application at home and work

- transfers strategies to variety of contexts
- encourages metacognition
- incorporates writing across content areas

Initiating event

At the beginning of each mini-course, activities were oriented toward engaging the background knowledge of the child care providers. Starting with information they already knew reinforced their self-confidence, established the importance of their prior knowledge, and lessened the stigma of the mini-course as remediation. Starting instruction by building on strengths also decreased the alienation and helplessness many students felt toward learning.

Initiating activities in the *Basic Issues* mini-course, for example, included the workers identifying the kinds of activities they do with children in their classroom, listing the developmental differences among infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, or discussing professionalism and its relevance to child care. Initiating activities in the *CDA* mini-course included brainstorming ideas before starting to write a draft on a particular competency area. The child care providers would individually list what they already do every day relating to, for example, safety and health issues.

Modeling and large group discussion

The next step in the mini-course was the instructor modeling a technique such as predicting content from text headings or highlighting the main ideas in an article. "Think-alouds" were often used by the instructor as she demonstrated a variety of reading comprehension strategies and, more importantly, the process and purpose for using them. The instructor in the *Basic Issues* mini-course would talk about strategies in her search for meaning while encouraging mini-course members to contribute ideas in a large group discussion. This combination of teacher modeling and large group discussion was usually successful but was altered as needed according to the level of prior knowledge of the child care providers.

The instructor in the *CDA* mini-course then modeled prewriting strategies for turning the brainstorming ideas into drafts. "Think-alouds" were often used for demonstrating the process of turning the ideas into connected prose. Techniques for revising were also demonstrated along with strategies for responding to others' writing.

> *Like Freire's partner-teachers, midwife-teachers assist in the emergence of consciousness...Mid-wife-teachers focus not on their own knowledge (as the lecturer does) but on the students' knowledge. They contribute when needed, but it is always clear that the baby is not theirs but the student's.*
> *--Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule*
> *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*

Guided practice

The next step added a guided practice opportunity for the literacy techniques introduced during the modeling and group discussion step in the *Basic Issues* mini-course. Child care providers applied reading strategies collaboratively in small groups by attempting to use the strategy on a new piece of text or a different part of the group-modeled text. For example in the *Basic Issues* mini-course, after modeling specific strategies for finding the main ideas by using the headings and subheadings and then determining the appropriateness/inappropriateness of these activities for children, the child care providers were given an opportunity for guided practice. This was accomplished using the collection of articles previously mentioned (see Appendix A). Child care providers were asked to find the main ideas by using the headings and subheadings. Then, they determined if the appropriateness strategies modeled earlier could be applied to these main ideas.

It was observed that the differing literacy levels represented by the students strengthened this peer interaction. Students often turned to each other to ask for clarification or feedback. This supportive environment proved useful as the child care providers came to understand how to apply the strategy. Moreover, it developed a sense of family in the mini-course with the more able helping the less able. This sense of family served to motivate the child care providers to continue to become active and participate in future mini-courses. Finally, this small group collaborative activity validated students roles as co-teachers.

Once the processes for brainstorming, revising, and editing were modeled, for the *CDA* mini-course for example, class time was used mostly as a writing workshop with time for responding and editing. Specific criteria were established for the writer to evaluate the content of their writing. These criteria were also used by responders as they listened and reacted to others' writing. Students also responded to each other's writing using the writing workshop as a forum to clarify their thoughts and ideas.

Independent practice

The fourth step gave the child care providers a chance to independently practice the new techniques. Strategies were applied to further sections of the modeled text or other relevant text of their choosing. Some of this independent practice was begun in the classroom However, the great majority was performed outside of class, furthering the educational environment beyond the time and space constraints of the classroom. Much of our continued participation and learner gain might be attributed to this expanded time on task. Independent practice became necessary outside of the *CDA* mini-course in order to complete the amount of writing for the credential.

Graduation ceremony

A final component of each class was recognition for the workers who participated. A brunch was given in honor of those attending each class at which Certificates of Attendance were presented. This recognition provided feedback to the workers on the importance of what we place on literacy improvement. For adults who have had little, if any, academic success in their lives, this recognition was well- received.

Assessment and Evaluation

Worker's and instructor's perspective

Evaluator's perspective

Conclusions

Summary

With our participatory instructional approach, the responsibility for each mini-course's success was shared by child care providers, instructors, and evaluators. Child care providers were constantly encouraged to supply feedback to the instructor and to monitor their satisfaction with class progress. Instructors were encouraged to assess and adapt their instruction to the workers' needs. Evaluators were encouraged to assess the workers' progress with tools that informed both the worker and the instructor. This triangulation led us to select some specific assessment tools while we developed others in a formative effort to identify the most valid instruments and procedures for evaluating worker progress.

Worker's and instructor's perspective

Since the responsibility for the mini-course success is shared with the learner in our participatory approach, child care providers were constantly encouraged to provide feedback to the instructor and to monitor their satisfaction with mini-course progress. Moreover, instructors were encouraged to assess and adapt their teaching to this information. For example, additional modeling of a technique might be done if the guided practice resulted in confusion. During the guided practice, workers were directed to relate the information they found to situations typically found in their classrooms. The relevance or lack of applicability to their situation was discussed in large and small groups. This provided the instructor, and more importantly, the worker with an opportunity to formatively evaluate the ideas within a functional context.

Evaluator's perspective

A variety of formal assessment instruments were used to document worker gain from the evaluator's perspective. We were attempting to document gain in both workforce literacy and general literacy from both quantitative and qualitative viewpoints as well as to document improved productivity. Several instruments were piloted to find the best mix which would be both informative and non-intrusive to formatively evaluate the curriculum. This also would provide a triangulation on the worker's perceptions and the instructors' perceptions as measured by the informal procedures discussed above.

Initially, a standardized reading test (the *Adult Placement Indicator*) was piloted as a quantitative indicator of general literacy performance level. The *Adult Placement Indicator* satisfied our non-intrusive criterion, since it was typical of most traditional general literacy measures, and the child care providers reported being comfortable with its format. Since child care providers are required by Texas regulations to have a high school diploma or GED, their performance on this instrument was rather successful. This provided them with a successful experience near the beginning of the mini-course. Moreover, this instrument was useful to identify those providers with lower reading abilities, so that the instructor could provide more instructional time for them. However, this instrument failed to aid us in assessing the worker's abilities to read job-related materials.

Therefore, we developed a cloze test as a measure of workforce education performance. This cloze test was based on a passage taken from a child care journal available to all child care centers via subscription (see Appendix B for a copy of the cloze passage). We selected this journal article since it was indicative of the type of information from which we were preparing these child care providers for learning.

For all the *Basic Issues* mini-courses, the child care providers and the instructor reported being very uncomfortable with the cloze task and the child care providers' performance reflected it. All but one class of child care providers performed at the frustration level for this material. This was not unexpected given the readability level of the article was found to be 13th grade level.

While a cloze task is theoretically sound and measures the reading process more directly than the traditional product oriented test like the general literacy measure, it was not sensitive enough to measure the child care providers' new found reading ability in the *Basic Issues* mini-course. Had we re-written the workplace related passage to a lower readability level, the child care providers might have had more success with it. Then, it might have been more sensitive to their abilities and the change in these abilities over the course of the instruction. Therefore, we delay our recommendation on the use of the cloze test as a measure of workforce education until others have an opportunity to use it in workplace related material that is written at an appropriate readability level.

To address this sensitivity concern, we also constructed a qualitative assessment instrument (see Appendix B) to measure literacy performance gain. This qualitative assessment instrument presented a scenario to the child care provider and asked her to explain how she would respond (e.g., two children fighting over a toy). Next, the child care provider was asked to read a short journal article and to again explain how she would respond. Third, she was asked if the article had changed her responses and in what ways. Finally, the child care provider was asked where else she might find information. These scenarios proved useful for assessing the child care providers' prior knowledge, ability to apply, evaluate, and synthesize information from print, their metacognitive self-awareness of their reading ability, and their knowledge of available resources.

In the *CDA* mini-course, to consider the sensitivity issue, we adapted a writing apprehension scale (Daly and Miller, 1975; see Appendix B). This instrument allowed us to assess reduced anxiety in writing following our instruction. Over the three iterations of the mini-course, we saw marked reduction in writing apprehension. We would recommend this instrument for informing the instructor, the child care providers, and the evaluators.

To satisfy our concerns with attrition rates in traditional adult education programs, we measured attendance rates for our seven iterations of the two mini-courses. These rates averaged from 64% for the *Basic Issues* mini-course to 83% for the *CDA* mini-course, which was significantly above the national average of 25% (Chisman, 1990). We argue that our collaborative approach to workforce education as well as our curriculum has much to do with this reduced attrition.

For the *CDA* mini-course we measured the amount of time on task child care providers were spending outside of class time for evaluating our instructional effectiveness. While this measure is difficult at best to document, we asked the child care providers to approximate the amount of time spent on Independent Practice utilizing the strategies both on the job and at home. For this mini-course, child care providers reported spending anywhere from 2 hours to 12 hours weekly in Independent Practice. Much of our gain in worker performance can be attributed to this commitment on the part of the child care providers to practice outside of class. We argue the collaborative, relevant nature of our instruction fosters this commitment.

To measure productivity in the *Basic Issues* mini-course, we first asked what indicators of quality were present in the child care literature. Looking at research documents for evidence of what the field documented as quality, we found a major factor was the type of verbal interactions the child care providers had with children (Phillips, 1987). Therefore, we developed a scale to document the type and number of verbal interaction made by child care providers with children and with peers (see Appendix B for a copy of this instrument). During the first application of this instrument, two raters were trained in observations, then they collected verbal interaction data in the same classrooms. We found inter-rater reliability to be above 95% supporting the consistency of our training procedures. Next, a trained observer sat in the classrooms of a stratified sample of the child care providers as well as a control group and documented verbal interactions for 45 minutes (at the rate of 10 minutes documenting then 5 minutes not documenting). This instrument allowed us, as a result of our instruction, to document increased verbal interactions in some positive ways (e.g., praising, asking questions, describing, giving directions), while reduced verbal interactions in some negative ways (criticizing, lecturing, explaining the consequences) were documented.

In the future mini-courses, funded through state means (see above), the instructors plan to use this instrument to have the child care providers self-evaluate their performance. This continuous evaluation of verbal interactions should inform the instructor and the child care providers of progress toward a more productive child care classroom.

Another means of measuring productivity in the *Basic Issues* mini-course was a change in the classroom environment. The literature again suggested that more productive child care providers have a more "literate" classroom environment. Therefore, we developed an instrument to document the quality of the classroom environment (see Appendix B for a copy of this instrument). This instrument allowed us to document improved quality of the classroom environment along several variables (e.g., amount of functional labels, amount of print or writing segments, amount of different books, amount of related books, more child written messages, and fewer commercial messages).

A third instrument that was used to document productivity for the *Basic Issues* mini-course was an improved overall child care environment along nine indicators (see Appendix B for a copy of this instrument). However, in those classrooms where the pretest showed few indicators of stimulating activity centers for the children, there was marked improvement in how the classroom environment changed. This was due to an emphasis on the development of an appropriate classroom environment. More change might have been documented given more time on the part of the child care providers to implement changes in their overall child care environment and given these providers were not constrained by budget limitations.

For the *CDA* mini-course, we chose to use completion of the CDA credential as a measure of productivity. By the end of the granting period, 55% of the child care providers who completed the course completed their CDA credential with the remaining providers continuing to write and planning to apply for the credential in the future.

We would, therefore, recommend a variety of job-specific literacy measures. Specifically, we would recommend using a traditional literacy measure (like the *Adult Placement Indicator*) to inform both child care providers and instructors about general literacy performance and to document transfer of workforce education performance to general literacy performance for the evaluator. Moreover, we would recommend selecting workplace material that is more appropriate to the worker's performance level when utilizing a cloze test. We still believe the cloze test should be used as a more viable measure of reading process in workplace related materials. We would recommend continued experimentation with our qualitative assessment instruments. These qualitative instruments might be able to replace the traditional literacy measure and the cloze test as multiple literacy performances are documented into a portfolio. We would recommend utilizing a Writing Apprehension scale to document for the child care providers, instructor, and evaluator reduced apprehension about the writing process. We would recommend monitoring attendance to confirm whether the WIN Instructional Model will reduce attrition in other job settings. We would recommend documenting worker's time on task outside of class, both on-the-job and at home, to confirm our data. We would recommend using our three productivity measures to document change in the child care provider's verbal interactions, the change in how literate the child care classroom has become, and the overall classroom environment. All of these instruments beg for experimentation, adaptation, and dissemination.

Conclusions

The final responsibility of any workforce literacy effort is determining whether the needs of all concerned parties have been met and then communicating this to each stakeholder. As you may know, one of the complicated aspects of workforce education is the number of stakeholders who may be involved. In our case, we had eight separate stakeholders for each mini-course: SWT, the WIN program staff, the USDOE, an outside evaluator, each of the child care providers, the two Chambers of Commerce, and the workforce literacy field at large. In order to clarify these priorities, we sought out the advice of an outside consultant. This proved to be extremely fruitful as we discovered that a grid showing "WHO wants WHAT MEASURE for WHAT PURPOSE" was useful for our formative and summative evaluation.

Following this suggestion, we chose to satisfy these stakeholders on two levels. On a long-term level, SWT, the USDOE, an outside evaluator, the two Chambers of Commerce, and the workforce literacy field at large will receive this document to inform them in future decisions about workforce literacy implementation for child care centers. On a more immediate level, the WIN staff and the child care providers received the information to meet their needs for refining the curriculum and the instruction. We found it vital to make sure that needed feedback was given to and received from each stakeholder at this immediate level and that this communication was fostered so that future mini-courses can be developed.

In the end, we determined five questions should be answered by this WIN demonstration project. These questions and the answers also document the success of this project.

Did we reach our service goals?
Our project as a whole served 232 workers in four job families from 33 separate small businesses. In this Child Care Job family specifically, we offered seven iterations of two different mini-courses to 49 child care providers. Of those 49 child care providers, 37 successfully completed the mini-courses, for an average retention rate of 76%, significantly above traditional adult literacy retention rates (Chisman, 1990).

Was instruction successful?
The holistic nature of our instruction proved successful from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives. We were able to pilot quantitative and qualitative general and workplace-specific literacy measures and determine the effectiveness of each. We were able to develop informal measures of workforce education from the child care provider's, the instructor's, and the evaluator's perspectives. From those who completed the *Basic Issues* mini-course, 11 out of 26 child care providers self-selected to attend the *CDA* mini-course. This speaks well of our instruction in that workers found so much benefit that they chose to return and enroll in a second mini-course. Moreover, 8 child care providers who completed the *CDA* mini-course successfully completed their portfolio, have been assessed through the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, and have been awarded the CDA credential. Most of the others are completing their portfolios and have every intention to apply for their credential. Finally, two of the participants from an early iteration of the *Basic Issues* mini-course were parents. After enrolling in our mini-course, they were subsequently hired as child care providers. This bodes well for this mini-course, serving as a preparation guide for employment as a child care provider.

Quantitative and qualitative test results confirm the project's effectiveness with gains in average general literacy, workforce education, and productivity measures. Average change in writing apprehension suggested improved self-confidence among these child care providers in their ability to write.

Anecdotal reports indicated that child care providers changed their perceptions and attitudes toward their work. Realizing the importance of their influence on young children's lives, they were motivated to learn more about providing quality care. Their attitudes changed when they perceived that their work was providing more for children than "just baby-sitting." Child care providers also reported that they had greater confidence in their abilities to respond to parents and their needs and concerns. Several providers when completing the work for the CDA assessment, remarked that they thought that they had been incapable of learning anything new. They were surprised and pleased that they could continue to learn and grow.

Did the mini-courses continue beyond the granting period?

The 18-month life of this grant was not long enough to deal with the whole of the community need for workforce literacy among child care providers. WIN Advisory Council meetings and discussions with former and current child care providers indicate a continuing need for the types of literacy instruction covered in the mini-courses offered for this Child Care Job Family. As evidence of a continuation, a local child care provider was able to acquire grant funds to continue offering the *Basic Issues* mini-course to others.

Due to the turnover rate and low wages in child care, there is a need for continuing education that helps child care providers gain the necessary skills to be effective. The motivation to attend mini-courses that specifically relate to their job demands is high among child care providers. In addition, the child care industry is focusing on increased professionalism and training for child care providers. This is evidenced by the recent passage of revised minimum standards in the state of Florida. In those revisions, a CDA is going to be a minimum requirement to be hired in a child care center (no such credential was required previously). Child care directors and child care providers in other states have concerns that such requirements will become more widespread. Thus, the interest in mini-courses designed to specifically prepare a more productive, professional child care workforce is becoming more prevalent. Using a curriculum as the one we developed can help meet this need.

Under what conditions is this project replicable?

WIN's Instructional Model has demonstrated its flexibility and replicability by being used in eight different mini-courses across four job families: Custodial, Child Care, Manufacturing, and Equipment Operators. Within the Child Care Job Family, the model was used for a *Basic Issues* mini-course and a *CDA* mini-course. Two of these mini-courses were taught by two different instructors to test out the transferability to instructors and to child care providers from a number of workplaces. The holistic nature of our instructional model should be replicable to a number of sites outside the San Marcos area. The applicability of our specific lesson plans, however, will depend to what degree your child care providers, business climate, and other resources match our programs.

How was the project disseminated?

The WIN demonstration project has produced several tangible end products. This guide contains a narrative of our process for developing mini-courses for the Child Care Job family, course outlines and lesson plans, sample administrative forms, original qualitative and quantitative assessment instruments and accompanying user's information, and a selected bibliography. Similar guides exist for mini-courses for the Manufacturing, Custodial, and Equipment Operator Job Families. The mini-courses for the Manufacturing Job Family teach mathematical constructs from basic operations to working with decimals, percentages, and fractions, to reading blueprints. The mini-courses for Custodial job family teach strategies for accessing print resources to solve job-related problems as well as writing for clerical job tasks. The mini-courses for the Equipment Operators Job Family focus on passing job-related certification examinations. Within each guide, program implementation strategies from both an administrative and an instructional viewpoint are also provided.

There are several important reasons for a thorough dissemination of this project's results, and several different strategies are required to accomplish such a dissemination. One need was to create good public relations for the project and its partners. To do this we have been in contact with various state and local news agencies. This is a successful literacy program that needs to be part of the community consciousness. A newspaper report is included in Appendix C. We would recommend you promote your workforce literacy program to solicit future endeavors.

Next, we wished to benefit and strengthen the newly emerging field of workforce education. For this, we needed to produce publications for a professional audience and make presentations at relevant conferences. This audience of experts helped us through peer review to refine our own program. The qualitative assessment instruments were introduced at a workforce literacy conference in Dallas, and the WIN Instructional Model was presented at the national COABE conference in Bismarck, ND, at the annual national meeting of the National Association of Developmental Education in San Antonio, TX, and at the annual meeting of the College Reading and Learning Association in San Francisco, CA.

Next, and perhaps more importantly, we need to use this material in a continuing effort to educate the child care provider community about the need for workforce education and the resources which are available to meet that need. In order to do this we have contacted the child care provider trade journals and made presentations at child care provider conferences. We must cultivate an understanding of child care provider needs and develop a presence within child care provider-oriented organizations. This will help us create the true child care provider-education partnership needed to guarantee this country's economic future.

Summary

Our project demonstrates that a holistic, participatory, process-oriented workforce education program created in partnership with a small-business community within a small city can meet the needs of both employees and employers in overcoming the skills gap currently existing in business and industry in this country. Furthermore, we assert that the participatory approach is essential in developing those Information Age skills like problem-solving, teamwork ability, and communication skills. In addition, the process-oriented rather than content-oriented nature of our instructional approach will support the growth of child care providers who must be flexible enough to cope with a constantly changing work environment by transferring their learning skills to each new situation which calls on them to master a new curriculum, work comfortably with a new process, or make a positive contribution as part of a restructured organization.

> *"By getting my CDA credential, I am able to talk to parents with more confidence. Before this class, whatever parents said I went along with. Now I feel that I have some professional ideas to offer."*
> *--CDA Credential Student*

Appendices

Appendix A: Sample lesson plans

Appendix B: Evaluation forms

Appendix C: Local promotion of program

Selected Bibliography

Workforce Skills

Background Theory

Practitioner Resources

APPENDIX A

LESSON PLANS

BASIC ISSUES IN CHILD CARE

WORKFORCE INSTRUCTIONAL NETWORK SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEN AND WHERE: Classes will meet on Thursday evenings, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. for 10 weeks starting Feb. 20. Classes will be held at First Baptist Church, 330 W. Hutchison Street. Park on North Street by the west side of the church and enter at the doors by the First Baptist Church Child Development Center sign. ALL CLASSES FREE. Instructor: Lisa Withrow

Feb. 20 - Week 1 - ISSUE: PROFESSIONALISM
Reading: "Developing a Sense of Wonder in Young Children" P. Haiman

Feb. 27 - Week 2 - ISSUE: UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN
Reading: "Milestones of Development" from ESSENTIALS

March 5 - Week 3 - ISSUE: UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN - Early reading
Reading: "Learning to Read" - M. Puckett & J. Black

March 12 - Week 4 - ISSUE: UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN - Early writing
Reading: "Crayons and Markers" - S. Waldrop & A.M. Scarborough

March 26 - Week 5 - ISSUE: PLANNING APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES
Reading: "How to Choose a Preschool Curriculum" - C. Fikes
"Quality Infant/Toddler Caregiving" - A. Honig

April 2 - Week 6 - ISSUE: PLANNING APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES
Reading: "Cognitive Activities for Infants" - E.C. Heller
"Preschoolers and Academics: Some Thoughts" - J. Schickedanz, S. Chay, P. Gopin, L. Sheng, S. Song, & N. Wild

April 9 - Week 7 - ISSUE: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
Reading: "Organizing Space for Children" - C. Bowers

April 16 - Week 8 - ISSUE: INTERACTING WITH CHILDREN
Reading: "Baby Talk"
"Toddlers: What to Expect"

April 23 - Week 9 - INTERACTING WITH CHILDREN
Reading: DISCIPLINE - J.G. Stone

April 30 - Week 10 - COMMUNICATING AND WORKING WITH PARENTS
Reading: "Communicate with Infants and Parents" - A. McLeod

BASIC ISSUES IN CHILD CARE - Class #1

INTRODUCTION

1. Registration forms available for students to complete as they arrive.
2. Introduction of instructors and students to eachother.
3. Explanation and administration.of assessment instrument.
4. Discuss expectations of "taking a class" and the feelings that are evoked. Discuss how the expectations and involvement in this class is different from traditional classroom experiences.

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

5. Class will identify their own prior knowledge of what is involved in providing quality care for young children. Distribute Organizational framework questions (WHAT, HOW, WHY, WHO). These questions are designed to have participants identify WHAT they do with young children, HOW they do it, WHY they do it, and WHO they do it for. Each question will be considered separately. Students respond by first listing responses and then sharing responses with group discussion. Responses recorded on flip chart.
6. Reflect on responses listed on flip charts. Encourage students to summarize or generalize their reaction to all the responses listed. Students could recognize the complexity of the demands, how important and difficult a job this is.
7. What can we do to find out more about what you can do? Refer to flip chart question about finding more information. Use responses to transition to the article "Developing a Sense of Wonder in Young Children".

Discussion concerning the link between reading strategies (mapping) and relevance to workplace. We have only a very limited amount of time together. During this time we cannot possibly learn all we can about child care. Therefore, it is very important for us to help you to see that there is a great deal that you can learn ON YOUR OWN. The technique that we were using in the last class is just a way to help you find the important information in the articles we will be reading. The collection of articles provided for you is only a few samples of the many, many articles that are written to help us to learn all we can and to do the best we can for children. These articles are yours to keep. You can write in them if you want. This is different from the notion that you should never write in books. However, in order to get as much as you can from these articles, we ENCOURAGE you to write on the pages, underline ideas that you think are nifty, jot down little ideas that you think of while reading the articles.

MODELING AND GUIDED PRACTICE

8. Read Rachel Carson section of article. After reading opening section, ask students to predict what the author might suggest that a teacher could do to develop a sense of wonder in young children. Have students write ideas and then share as a group. Look at remainder of article to see what the author said. Is it what you expected? Were you surprised? Was there anything you particularly agreed with?
9. Can this article be used in your day to day work with children? This article is more an attitude piece - how to think about what you do. HOW we think about what we do has to do with PROFESSIONALISM.

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

10. PROFESSIONALISM article - Have students complete "Professionalism in Child Care" sentence completion sheet. Discuss what professionalism means in child care. Ask participants to listen and/or look for child care issues mentioned in the media (TV, magazines, radio, etc.) and report next week how many times or where they saw or heard child care issues mentioned.

WHAT DO WE DO WITH CHILDREN,
HOW DO WE DO IT,
WHY DO WE DO IT,
AND FOR WHOM?

WHERE CAN YOU FIND MORE INFORMATION?

PROFESSIONALISM IN CHILD CARE

1. To be a professional means that a person ______________________

____

____

____

2. A professional child care worker is ______________________

____

____

3. I chose to work in child care because ______________________

____

____

Basic Issues in Child Care - #2

Follow-up from previous class - PROFESSIONALISM

1. Try to recall or remember ideas of what or where child care issues were seen or mentioned during the week - have examples
   - a. Share ideas - as students share, write ideas in form of a map
   - b. After all ideas are offered, steer discussion to ideas that relate to professionalism
2. Redistribute professional sentence completion sheet. These are the ideas you have already about professionalism.
3. Refer to Professionalism article. These are ideas someone had when writing a textbook. Do you agree? Would you change or add to your ideas from this article?
   - a. Summary of article - Professionalism has specialized knowledge and a particular attitude. Discuss what kind of attitude (open to new ideas, flexible, etc.)
   - b. All these ideas are related to quality child care.
4. Another application of writing about your ideas and reading information related to your ideas.

   Give Pre-test Scenario - (Qualitative Assessment Instrument)

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

5. UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN - Refer to sheet listing issues and readings.
   - a. Discussion - What are 3 things that makes infants infants, toddlers toddlers, and preschoolers preschoolers? Jot down your ideas if that will help you to remember.
   - b. Share these responses. Ask how do you respond to these differences? Why do some of you only want to teach infants; some of you only preschoolers; toddlers?
   - c. There is much that you already understand about children through your experience - either in child care classes or your own children as a parent. Where might you learn more about understanding children and how to respond to them?

MODELING AND GUIDED PRACTICE

6. Distribute ESSENTIALS books. Refer to pages that have relevance (developmental milestones).
   - a. Go through structure in text. Highlight age groupings at top of page.
   - a. Model finding the age group with which you are currently working. Talk-aloud about children in your care and then read developmental expectations of these children. Decide if this milestone is observed in your classroom or not.
   - b. Group in pairs or groups of three and read through the milestones

using at least 3 or 4 developmental areas (communication, physical growth, emotional, etc.) and apply to children that you are currently working with. Describe these children to the others in your group. When looking at "What can an adult do" section, are there any new ideas you can find ?

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

7. HOMEWORK - Distribute checklist from another source. Ask class to comment on any obvious differences they see between the ESSENTIALS checklist and the homework example. Ask students to evaluate this checklist for its usefulness and if it helps them understand their children any better.

Basic Issues in Child Care - #3

1. Follow-up from previous class - UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN
   a. Discuss comparisons and evaluations of the developmental checklists from ESSENTIALS and the homework copy.
      'Was one more useful than the other? Why?
      'Did one help you to understand more about children? Why?
      'Was it easier to think of particular children with one checklist more than the other? Did one seem to be more "true" to what you know of children that are in your care?
      'How might parents react to one list as opposed to the other?
   b. Summarize class comments. Point out that you think about what you read based on what you already know. Sometimes there are ideas that you will disagree with in a text - and you will sometimes find new ideas that you never thought of before. Your responsibility as a professional is to make those decisions.

ENGAGING PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

2. Learning all we can about understanding children and their development is a never-ending process. Each child is unique and the books cannot possibly know about every situation that you will face. We constantly determine how we will react by using what we already know along with finding new information that will help us.

3. The focus of the remainder of this class will be on a particular area of development in children - EARLY READING. This was determined to be necessary because this is an area where people have many different opinions about what children should be doing in the years before public school. There is little disagreement that it is vitally important to read to children - to start as soon as babies can focus on an interesting page. Just about everyone knows they are supposed to read aloud to children, but not everyone does it consistently. Think about questions or problems that you have about reading aloud to children.
   'Make a list of those things you think are important to do with the children you care for to encourage early reading behaviors.
      - Share your lists.
   'Are you able to carry out what you believe in your classroom? Are there any "barriers" that keep you from doing what you think is important?

MODELING

4. What might help you to know more about carrying out what you believe in a group setting?

   *ESSENTIALS book has suggestions that include book-related ideas starting with babies - p. 45, toddlers - p. 51, preschoolers - p. 74.

   Can you find more ideas related to early reading and/or books?

5. DIMENSIONS article - LEARNING TO READ
   a. Distribute article and highlight the bold print, subtitles, etc.
   b. Provide time for students to read the article and add to their list about what they believe about early reading.
   c. As article is read, students should also make a list of any ideas that specify the TYPE of book appropriate for their age group. (Ex. - bring pictures, limited text, sturdy books for infants toddlers, etc.) Refer to p. 308 in ESSENTIALS.
   d. For those that finish reading before others, provide extra resources: MORE THAN THE ABC'S, Emergent Literacy folder of articles, READ-A-LOUD Handbook.

6. Summarize article - Ask if there are any new ideas they added to their lists as a result of reading the article. Discuss new ideas and relate back to further understanding of children and development. Discuss their lists describing the type of books appropriate for each age group

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

7. Where do you find books appropriate for your age group?

   A variety of responses would be expected - personal library, from friends, from the center where they work, etc.

   *If you were looking for books in the library, how would you find what you want? Discuss responses and highlight the variety of strategies that each has.

   *Are there any other ways to get to the books you want? Share card catalogue resource, browsing through a shelf of books; books about books; reference books (A to ZOO, etc.)

GUIDED AND INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

8. When you provide children with experiences that encourage interest and curiosity in books, certain behaviors will almost automatically occur.

   a. Distribute developmental checklist on early literacy behaviors, book reading with infants/toddlers, and book reading with preschoolers handouts. Briefly discuss those behaviors that have already been observed in young children and what might be new expectations.

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

ASSIGNMENT: Read books to the children you are with this week. Look for the early reading behaviors listed on the checklist. Think about any surprises or new expectations you had while watching and observing children while you read.

BOOK READING WITH INFANTS/TODDLERS

1. MAKE BOOKS AN OBVIOUS CHOICE

2. BE AWARE OF DEVELOPMENTAL DIFFERENCES IN BOOK READING BEHAVIOR:

0-3mos: receptive, staring
4-6mos: aware, eyes follow,touch, babble,sucking
6-9mos: page turning, chewing
12mos: pointing, routines
15mos: joins in, supplies words, asks "dat?"

2. GIVE THEM SOMETHING ELSE TO DO WITH THEIR HANDS

3. USE VOICES, GESTURES

4. TUNE IN TO THE CHILD'S BEHAVIOR AND STOP WHEN ATTENTION FADES

BOOKREADING WITH PRESCHOOLERS

1. HOLD BOOKS UP SO EVERYONE CAN SEE

2. ENCOURAGE DISCUSSION

Have you ever.....?
What would you do....?
What do you know about.....?
What do you think will happen next....?

3. RE-READ FAMILIAR BOOKS

4. ENCOURAGE JOINING IN WITH READING

5. KEEP IT SHORT

EARLY LITERACY BEHAVIORS CHECKLIST

BOOK KNOWLEDGE
___ receptive to bookreading
___ responds to bookreading (eyes, voice, touch)
___ turns pages
___ points, joins in
___ holds book upright, turns to front
___ discusses, elaborates on story
___ "pretends" to read

PRINT CONCEPTS
___ distinguishes between picture, print
___ knows left-right progression

BOOK LANGUAGE
___ conversational language telling story
___ book language telling story

ATTITUDE TOWARD BOOKS
___ often chooses books/ asks to be read to
___ "reads" to others (including dolls & bears!)
___ asks what things say
___ "writes" messages, letters, signs, etc.

BEGINNING WRITING
___ scribbles
___ letter-like shapes
___ random letters
___ invented spelling

Basic Issues in Child Care - #4

1. Follow-up from last class
   - 'Read through Early Literacy Checklist and have class contribute examples and anecdotes observed during book reading with their children during the previous week.

2. ISSUE: UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT - Early writing behavior
   For this class, an expert in emergent literacy was invited to discuss this issue. The expert was from the School of Education at the local university.

3. Transition following guest presentation: In order to provide an atmosphere that supports and encourages early writing behavior with young children, you need to provide the tools or ingredients for the children. Consider the CRAYONS AND MARKERS article.

MODELING

4. CRAYONS AND MARKERS article - mapping strategy

   PREVIEWING
   - 'Take 30 seconds and preview the article. Try to determine what the article is about.
   - 'Time the students for 30 seconds.
   - 'After 30 seconds, ask the students to report on what they looked at when they were "previewing" the article. This should include discussion about headings, subheadings, labels under pictures, bold print, etc.

   MAPPING
   - 'Make a large circle on the flip chart and ask students to give a word or two that describes what the article is about. Talk about how they reached the answer that they offer.
   - 'Ask students to offer ideas that are related to the bigger idea (age specific suggestions concerning writing/art materials). Continue to add related and sub-ideas.
   - 'If the observation is made that this is an article related to art activities and not writing, it would be worthwhile to discuss how related suggestions in an article can be related to other areas. Children's expression through art and writing are related.

GUIDED PRACTICE

'After reaching the this layer of mapping, allow time for the students to read the article and add more ideas that they find and add to their maps.

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

5. Homework: Give students another article related to early writing LITERACY DEVELOPMENT AND PRE-FIRST GRADE. Ask students to make a map of this article and bring to the following class.

Basic Issues in Child Care - #5

1. *Discussion concerning the link between reading strategies (mapping) and relevance to workplace.* We have only a very limited amount of time together. During this time we cannot possibly learn all we can about child care. Therefore, it is very important for us to help you to see that there is a great deal that you can learn ON YOUR OWN. The technique that we were using in the last class is just a way to help you find the important information in the articles we will be reading. The collection of articles provided for you is only a few samples of the many, many articles that are written to help us to learn all we can and to do the best we can for children. These articles are yours to keep. You can write in them if you want. This is different from the notion that you should never write in books. However, in order to get as much as you can from these articles, we ENCOURAGE you to write on the pages, underline ideas that you think are nifty, jot down little ideas that you think of while reading the articles.

2. Follow-up from previous class -
   'Have students that completed assignment (map an article) put their map or outline (or whatever strategy they used to show the main ideas) on a flip chart page. These students will do a "show and tell" about their ideas and explain how they decided to put what information or their maps. Students can also share how long it took them to complete the assignment.

   'Discuss that this strategy is a TOOL that eventually will not be needed as students will be able to pull out the important information without mapping.

3. Summary and transition
   'During the first weeks, we have been concentrating on understanding children - developmental milestones, early reading and writing. It is necessary: a prerequisite: to understand children in order to effectively work with them. As was mentioned earlier, we will NEVER be able to know everything there is to know about understanding children and their development. Please be aware that we have not told you all there is to know: nor have we looked at all the sources to help you learn more. THERE IS MUCH MORE OUT THERE TO READ AND LEARN.

•The next direction in which we will move has to do with planning appropriate activities for the children with which you work.

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

4. Initiating event: Distribute scenario for all to read.

SCENARIO: In XYZ Child Care Center, Timmy, a toddler who is 18 months old is sitting at a table watching the activity around him. On the table in front of him is a xeroxed coloring page of a butterfly. Several crayons are available for him to use for coloring. As Timmy is watching the activity, he is busily munching away at his crayon.

Students will write their reaction to this scenario in their journals.
PROMPTS:

- •How would you react if you saw this situation?
- •Is there anything you would change about this situation? Why or why not?

Students discuss their responses.

- •Determine what students know about appropriate and inappropriate practices for young children. In relation to the scenario presented, there are several "inappropriate" activities: xeroxed coloring pages limit children's creativity and expression; unsupervised crayoning may not be appropriate for all toddler-aged children
- •Discussion will center around what is meant by being APPROPRIATE. How do you decide if something is appropriate or not to do with children? Is it just common sense? Some examples seem to relate to common sense - but we maintain that as PROFESSIONALS, there is specialized knowledge that we have to plan most appropriately.

MODELING

5. The following is an outline of the strategies used to determine appropriateness/inappropriateness. Each of these four strategies will be explained in detail. Direct the students to think of an example within their work.

A. Age appropriate - developmental guidelines/norms
   - •expectations based on information we discussed in the last classes
   - •Examples: babies usually sit around 6 months

babies walk around 12 months
babies babble "ba-ba", "ma-ma". etc.

B. Individually appropriate
- consider each child as an individual; what might be meaningful or appropriate for one child may not be for another
- examples - puzzle abilities; age suggestions on toys

C. Meaningful
1. child has capability to learn something from experience, interaction, or activity
2. child can explore and discover
3. appeals to child's curiosity
4. "The process of interacting with materials and people results in learning" p. 3 DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE PRACTICE. NAEYC
5. child is able to hold. touch or manipulate materials appropriate to age level
6. activities relate to real-life experiences of age of child

D. Activities include all developmental areas of children
1. socio/emotional - how to get along with others;
   how you understand yourself; express how you feel
2. language/communication - express ideas effectively
3. thinking - (cognitive) decision making
4. physical - small muscles; large muscles

After discussion of these strategies, turn the outline into a map in order to visualize the concepts more clearly. While referring to the map. model three activities - one for infants, one for toddlers, and one for preschool-aged children. With each activity, discuss the four strategies for deciding if the activities are appropriate or not.

Activities:
Infants - blanket - peek-a-boo
Toddlers - sock stapled onto a box - tactile sense
Preschoolers - colored water mixing

Show each of these examples. Show sources from which they come to emphasize that one does not have to "create" ideas from nothing. Discuss activities in reference to the four considerations.

MODELING AND GUIDED PRACTICE

6. Transition to articles in reader - CHOOSING A PRESCHOOL CURRICULUM and QUALITY INFANT/TODDLER CAREGIVING. Model for the students. The first subheading in the QUALITY INFANT article is"Individualized, attentive loving" . Students need to decide if this is something different or the same as any of the four considerations. Hopefully, they will see that this subheading is similar to the second consideration for appropriateness. Divide into two groups - each group to consider one article. Each group should consider their article in reference to the four considerations for appropriateness. Instruct group to look at the subheadings and decide if the subheading fits into any of the four considerations.

There are seven or eight subheadings in each article. The students should consider these subheadings and categorize them according to the considerations. This should be done collaboratively in their small groups.

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

As homework, they should read the content in each subheading and determine if there is anything new or if the information is what they expected based on their prior knowledge.

Considerations to decide if an activity is appropriate

I. **Is it appropriate for the age group?**
  A. consider developmental guidelines and norms

II. **Are you considering the individual needs of children?**
  A. consider that every child is different and unique

III. **Is the activity meaningful?**
  A. can the child learn something from the experience
  B. can the child explore and discover
  C. does the activity appeal to the child's curiosity
  D. can the child hold, touch, or manipulate materials that are appropriate to age level
  E. the activities relate to real-life experiences of the child

IV. **Activities include all developmental areas of the child**
  A. social/emotional - feelings
  B. language/communication
  C. cognitive - thinking
  D. physical - small and large muscles

Basic Issues in Child Care - #6

1. Follow-up from previous class - QUALITY INFANT article
   - *Students share predictions of text following subheadings.
   - *Discuss subheadings in article and discuss where these ideas fit into the "considerations for appropriateness". (Class #5)

2. REVIEW - Refer to the Organizational Framework distributed in Class #1. Relate what has been covered so far in classes to the questions on the framework. This will be done by completing a map for the Organizational Framework. Students will add to the map as they identify those ideas and concepts they have learned in relation to the framework questions.

   *What do we do with children?
   - -How do the developmental milestones relate to this question?
   - -Does developmental knowledge impact what we do?
   - -Do we provide particular opportunities for children based on what we know?

   *How do we do it?
   - -During the classes on early reading and writing, did you find any new information on how to encourage these behaviors in the children with which you work?
   - -Relating the first 2 questions, HOW do you decide if WHAT you do with children is appropriate?
   - -The "HOW" issues will be dealt with more specifically in the remainder of classes if students do not think they have much to contribute to this question.

   *Why do we do it?
   - -How does profesionalism tie into this question?
   - -Do developmental milestones help to explain why?

   *For whom?
   - -children
   - -parents
   - -child care workers

   *Where can you find more information?
   - -Solicit answers to find if any specific sources are mentioned.

At this halfway point in class, the remining classes will focus more on the WHAT and HOW ideas that can be used every day in your rooms with children.

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

3. PLANNING APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES

Discussion: Before children are in your classroom, is there anything that you do to get ready for them? If there any advance planning that you do?

*The importance of this discussion is to have the child care workers realize that even if they do not write formal lesson plans, there is always some level of advance planning that they do. The ideas offered through articles and reading resources help to have more ideas to draw from. Ask the students if having more articles and moving toward writing more formal plans is important to them and WHY or WHY NOT. Some may be required be their center to have written plans; some may not.

MODELING

4. WHAT, HOW, and WHY hand-out

Distribute hand-out with organizing categories. Model how you would use this hand-out to record ideas that you hear about, read, find in books, or see used in other centers. Model from sources available - THEME-A-SAURUS I & II, infant articles, toddlers articles, etc.

*Modeling suggestions - some ideas derive from some material that has accumulated and you wnat to use (paper towel tubes); some ideas come from a developmental area for which you want to provide an experience (large motor activity); some ideas come from seeing another class, hearing teachers or other caregivers talk, etc.

GUIDED PRACTICE

After modeling, students will break into smaller groups and add three ideas (add more ideas if this seems to easily reached as a goal) for the age children they work with. For each idea, they should write WHAT, HOW and WHY. Resource books and curriculum ideas will be available.

EXTENDED GUIDED AND INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

6. We have only started to look at the available resources. Refer to the reader. So far, these articles have served different purposes. Look at each article and discuss WHY the article was important - (SENSE OF

WONDER - philosophical; professional; LEARNING TO READ - understanding children. etc.). Depending on the article, you would read them differently. The resources and articles that you worked with during class were to find ideas specifically that you can use with your children. We structured your reading by asking you to answer WHAT, WHY and HOW. There is one article that is not as obvious to understand why it is included. It has some very interesting information - but, the way it is written, it is harder to find the main ideas, etc. Therefore, we have a "guide-map" for you to help with the article. Read the article with the may beisde you. See if the may is helpful; if the article has any interest for you; if you agree with the main ideas. (Look through format of article for strange formatting concerns - i.e. reading around the "figure" sections.)

Next class - Focus will be on your classroom - commonly referred to as your ENVIRONMENT. It is interesting to think about how your room effects the children. For the next class, use the graph paper provided and draw a picture of your room. Show examples and explain the visual perpsective that must be taken.

Basic Issues in Child Care - #7

FOLLOW-UP FROM LAST CLASS

1. Take time as necessary to complete WHAT, WHY, and HOW lists. Make copies so all ideas are shared. Make copies of last week's homework - make transparency of each classroom.

2. Reactions to "Preschoolers and Academics" article and maps -
   - confirm that article is difficult to read
   - who is the article written for
   - where students able to find the ideas that were in the map in the article

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

TRANSITION TO NEW ISSUE

3. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT - Explain that "learning environment" refers to the space in your classroom; how it is organized. Refer to Organizational Framework map and decide where the "learning environment" fits. Discussion may lead in many directions - some may see "learning environment" fitting in the HOW question, but may also fit in the WHY question, etc. Students may see that all questions: WHAT, HOW, WHY, WHO need to be asked about the environment.

4. Show transparency of 2 hypothetical rooms - A and B.
   - In their notebooks, students will write about which room organization they prefer and WHY
   - Discuss preferences and reasons for decisions

GUIDED PRACTICE

5. Share floor plans

   Make transparency of each plan and students will "talk through" their plan and explain why their room is arranged as it is

GUIDED AND INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

6. Transition to article: ORGANIZING SPACE FOR CHILDREN
   - flip through article and discuss how the article is organized
     10 guidelines
   - distribute and explain hand-out for understanding the content of the article
   - The WHAT is the Guideline ,the HOW is the techniques to meet the WHAT, the WHY is explaining the purpose, the WHO is knowing which people the guideline would effect

-Discuss that they may be able to add more to each column than is in the article.

7. Modeling of reading strategies
    -Show how you would fill in the columns for the first guideline.
    -Have students fill in the second guideline as a group.
    -Students will continue working through the article independently or in pairs
    -The remaining guidelines should be assigned for homework.

INDEPENDENT WORK

8. Choose 2 or 3 of the guidelines and think about your classroom in respect to the guidelines. Would you change your room because of the guideline or not?

ORGANIZING SPACE FOR CHILDREN

WHAT Guideline	HOW	WHY	WHO	Do you agree with this guideline and how would you use it?

Basic Issues in Child Care - #8

FOLLOW-UP FROM LAST CLASS

1. Room organization - discuss the changes they made or plan to make in their rooms based on the Guideline sheet modeled in the last class

TRANSITION

2. Organizing space for children is never ending. Depending on the children that you have, your space may be arranged differently. You constantly ask yourself WHAT, WHY, and HOW no matter the issue. The next issue deals with HOW you interact with children. Before thinking of how you interact with children, we will think of how you interact with eachother.

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

3. Initiating Event: Think about times that you talk over ideas with others. Think about those things that the other person does to help you feel that your ideas are accepted or worthwhile.

**Journal writing: Identify specific behaviors you think help communication between two people/or among a group of people:*
**Identify specific behaviors you think stop communication between or among people.*

Share these responses.

DISCUSSION: **How** we say things to other people is as important as **what** we say. Do you change how you "say things" when you talk with children? What do you change when talking with children, if you do change?

MODELING

4. DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE PRACTICE books (NAEYC publication) Look at the interaction sections for each age group. Read an example of what is appropriate/inappropriate and then model WHY you think it is appropriate or inappropriate. Relate your decision-making process to strategies that have already been used in class.
   Ex. p. 41 - the example before the living and learning with toddlers
   *Adults model the type of interactions with others that........
   This example uses developmental milestones and techniques of redirecting children's behavior appropriately

   Continue to read through examples in pairs or small groups and have students justify WHY they think that the examples were decided to be appropriate or inappropriate.

5. NAEYC interaction checklist

   Describe what the NAEYC accreditation system is in order to provide a context for the checklist. This describes what is agreed to be high quality interaction. Discuss that this checklist is for their own personal use.

GUIDED AND INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

6. TRANSITION - Shift in direction and focus

   At the end of these classes, your interest in knowing more about child care issues will hopefully not be completely satisfied. There will be more that you want to know. Before the classes are over, we want to take time to "practice" getting the information that you want. Therefore, the remainder of this class time tonight will allow you to make decisions about what you want to know more about. After an overview of the choices available, decide on what you want to find out. At the end of class, we will come together to discuss how successful you were in doing what you wanted or finding what you needed.

   Choices:

   - Infant/Toddler articles from TEXAS CHILD CARE
   - NAEYC accreditation materials
   - Resource books: THEME-A-SAURUS, etc.
   - Resource catalogues - Red Leaf Press, NAEYC
   - Book clubs - Scholastic, Early Learning

HOMEWORK

Distribute copies of DISCIPLINE to read for next class. Identify any strategies in the reading that reinforces, supports, or expands on the WHAT, HOW, and WHY questions.

Basic Issues in Child Care - #9

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

1. DISCIPLINE: Students read the book DISCIPLINE for this week. Without referring to the book, have students write in their journals what they think of when considering "discipline".

   Share responses. Refer to definition in DISCIPLINE book. Is their definition similar or not? What is the same? What is different? Why?

2. Consider this summary from ESSENTIALS book (p. 234). Relate the material in DISCIPLINE to these main ideas. Reinforce the idea that we often focus our ideas of "discipline" on the last idea shown in the outline box (*solve problems with a positive approach). There are MANY ideas that relate to discipline. Look at the subtitles and main ideas in DISCIPLINE and relate back to the summary box.

3. When problems do come up, we need to have a plan of what to do. We need a "plan". However, there is no one solution that will work every time for every child. All children are different, therefore, solutions must have many options.

   Students will take time to write individually the steps they take already in their classrooms when "problems" arise. What do they do first? If that does not work, what do they do next? Etc.

   Share responses and make a list from their responses.

   POSSIBLE LIST - talk through with list with examples

   1. Avoid problems through preparation of environment
      *Hand-out of problems, possible causes, and solutions
   2. Ignore unwanted behavior if possible (no child is upset; no child will get hurt - discuss situations where it is OK to ignore)
   3. Redirect unacceptable behavior of child to another activity
   4. Redirect unacceptable behavior of child to express his or her frustration appropriately
   5. Isolation - hand-out on time-out

GUIDED PRACTICE

4. Practice using the ideas in the plans for dealing with problems. Look at the last section in DISCIPLINE where appropriate responses are offered. If these responses are appropriate, what might an inappropriate response be to the situation? Model for students that they first must determine

what the situation is. Next, look at the appropriate response. Then they think of a response that would be an inappropriate way to respond. Explain why the response in inappropriate. Model several reponses. Divide into pairs or smaller groups and assign a particular column of responses to each group. Have each group report back with two or three "inappropriate" responses, how they arrived at the inappropriate response, and why it is inappropriate.

5. If the idea of 'working with the parents of a particular child when a problem arises' has not been mentioned, discuss this as another idea that will go in their list of possible solutions. As was discussed previously, HOW you talk to a parent about a particular concern you have with their child is important. The last articles that we have in the reader discuss way to help you communicate more effectively with parents. Time permitting, look at the main ideas (subheadings) in the articles and determine those factors that are considered important to have parents working with you.

WORKFORCE INSTRUCTIONAL NETWORK
Southwest Texas State University
School of Education

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE CREDENTIAL
REVISED PROCESS

Classes will be held at First Baptist Church, 330 W. Hutchison Street, San Marcos, on Monday evenings, from 7:00 - 9:00 p.m., from June 15 through August 3 (8 weeks). Ann Johnson, Instructor

June 15	Introduction to CDA credential process formal training requirement credential fees background and statements of competence
June 22	Competence Goal 1: Establish and maintain a safe, healthy learning environment
June 29	Competence Goal 2: Advance physical and intellectual competence
July 6	Competence Goal 3: Support social and emotional development and provide positive guidance
July 13	Competence Goal 4: Establish positive and productive relationships with families
July 20	Competence Goal 5: Ensure a well-run, purposeful program responsive to participant needs
July 27	Competence Goal 6: Maintain a commitment to professionalism
August 3	Share ideas in resource collection Edit, revise, and wrap-up

Child Development Associate Credential Class

The Child Development Associate Credential (CDA) class was designed to help students develop the strategies and writing skills necessary to complete the writing requirements of the CDA credential.

Background Information

In June 1992, the credential was revised. The revision did not alter the content required, but changed the format for presenting the ideas. The Child Development Associate Assessment System and Competency Standards ($5.00) is the publication of the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, the agency that awards and coordinates the credentialing process. This publication contains the requirements to complete the credential and was used as a text in the CDA class. The publication comes in four different versions. Students need to determine which version corresponds with the children in their care. The four versions are Infant/Toddler, Preschool, Family Home Provider, and Home Visitor. This publication can be ordered from:

The Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition
1341 G Street, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3105
(800)-424-4310

There is a fee associated with the credential. Each state has an agency that awards scholarships to help with the credentialing fee. Contact the Council office to determine the agency in your particular state that distributes the funds.

CDA Credential Class - Revised credential
Class #1

1. Complete registration forms and introductions
2. Statement to confirm professionalism
3. Overview of credentialing process - Arrangements should be made with someone (Head Start education coordinator, instructor at local community college, etc.) who is very familiar with the credentialing process to present an overview and answer questions.

    *Application packet, credential fees scholarship info, addresses
    *Formal training requirement
    *Direct assessment steps
        -documents
        -resource file

ENGAGE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

4. To complete a CDA credential, there is a significant amount of writing you must complete. Think back on writing that was expected of you in your last schooling experience. Reactions? Discuss how your program differs from "traditional" expectations of what happens in 'school'.
5. Before we get into writing in this class, complete a survey. This has no right or wrong answers. Answer based on how you feel about writing. Give Writing Apprehension survey and writing interview. (See sample survey in Child Care Asseessment Appendix)
6. Overview of writing process
    *Name someone you know who is a good writer. What makes that person a good writer.
    *Good writers are not born writing well. Finished products do not automatically occur.
    *Handout - Stages of the Writing Process - discuss stages

MODELING

7. Brainstorming
    a. Read competency statement 1 - brainstorm what you already do
    b. When ideas stop, turn to the ESSENTIALS text and read for more ideas. Find competency statement in table of contents. Look through section and add ideas to list.

GUIDED PRACTICE

8. Brainstorming
    a. Have students brainstorm their ideas and list them individually.
    b. Share lists and add to your list if any ideas you hear are ones you

would want to include.

c. After listing many ideas, what do you do next? Need to turn your ideas into complete sentences. MODEL turning idea into sentence.

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE

a. Have student practice turning ideas into drafts

8. RESOURCE FILE - Refer to hand-out with 17 items to be included in resource file. Refer to items and brainstorm where each particular item could be found. Consider ways that the Resource file items could be gathered for the benefit of the whole group. Possiblility of each student finding a particular item that could be shared with the group. Some items could be shared - some items would be more of a personal selection.

ASSIGMENT - Complete draft of Competency Area 1 to be shared in next class.

STAGES OF THE WRITING PROCESS

PREWRITING

DRAFTING

REVISING

EDITING

PUBLISHING

CDA Class #2

1. Distribute Writing Apprehension Surveys - score is to reflect the amount of fear you have about writing. A score of 41 or below is low - a score of 70 or above is high. Discuss if this reflects how they feel or not.
2. Hand-out - RESPONDING TO OTHERS' WRITING
   Go through each type of response with examples
3. MODEL - Ask for volunteer that will read his or her writing as instructor assumes role as responder. Model responses and solicit more responses.
4. Statement of competence #1
   Read your ideas to your partner.
   You will be the reader - so if your draft is not completed, you can still share your ideas.
   It makes no difference at THIS time what stage your writing is in
   *EMPHASIS on sharing IDEAS
5. DISCUSSION - How effective is this process
   Was it easy to respond, know what to say?
   Was the feedback helpful?

6. WRITING WORKSHOP
   During this time, you can revise or work on what you have read and/or written for compentency statement #1. You can work with a partner, someone else, or bring your writing for me to read. Do not bring it to me, however, until you had a chance to read it to someone else.

7. DRAFT ideas for competency statement #2 following brainstorming procedure used in first class. Work to bring draft to share for next class.

8. RESOURCE FILE INFORMATION - Look at list of information that is required and brainstorm ideas where this information can be found. Decide who might find information to share with class. Everyone must agree to share what they have found - and have enough ideas for everyone to research an item to contribute.

RESPONDING TO OTHERS' WRITING

TYPE OF RESPONSE	EXAMPLES
1. LISTEN	listen to author read aloud "What can I help you with?"
2. ASK QUESTIONS THAT HELP THE AUTHOR TALK ABOUT THE PIECE	"Tell me more about this part." "How did you feel when that happened?" "Tell me what you want to say."
3. GIVE A PERSONAL RESPONSE	"When you were writing about....it made me feel....because...." "That made me think of...." "I feel the same way you do about...."
4. MAKE SPECIFIC POSITIVE REMARKS	"I really liked the way you.... ....organized ....used interesting words ....used specific examples ....described...."

CDA Class #3

1. Review guidelines for responding to other's writing. Distribute handout that lists the CONTENT that you will listen for in the competency statements.
2. Pair students with partners that are not from their workplace. They will read their competency statement #1 to eachother and respond according to the guidelines.
3. Distribute REVISING CHECKLIST. After reading and gathering responses to their work, each writer makes a decision based on the choices offered on the REVISING CHECKLIST.
4. WRITING WORKSHOP: Students will spend 45 minutes to an hour drafting, revising, or writing on competency statement #2. Students will continue to serve as responders to eachothers' writing.

6. RESOURCE FILE INFORMATION: Continue to look at list of information that needs to be collected. Assign at least two more sources that will be brought to class in two weeks.

CDA COMPETENCY GOALS

When you write your competency goal statements, consider these questions as a guide to your writing. You will also use these questions as a guide when you are responding to other's writing.

1. STAYING ON TRACK

   Am I writing about the competency goal area or am I using ideas that will fit more appropriately into another competency goal?

   *You need to keep in mind all of the 6 competency goal areas in order to know WHAT fits WHERE.

2. ORGANIZATION

   Have I written my goals for children in the competency goal area followed by specific examples?

   *Goals give you direction as to WHY you make decisions the way you do. The goals give the reason why you used the examples that you chose.

3. CLARITY

   Is my writing clear and easy to understand?

REVISING CHECKLIST

Author______________________ Title___________________________

Date____________________

______I have reread my writing piece to see if it says *what I want it to say*

______I have asked myself the following questions about my piece.

  ______Does the organization make sense?

  ______Have I said enough?

  ______Have I said too much?

  ______Is my writing suited to my audience?

______I have read my piece to someone else to get feedback.

Status:

  ______This piece needs more work.

  ______This piece just needs editing/polishing.

  ______This piece is finished.

(adapted from various checklists in the following sources:

Heller, M.F. (1991). Reading-writing connections. New York: Longman.

Tompkins, G.E. (1990). Teaching writing--Balancing process and product. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CDA Class #4

1. Refer to and briefly review the responding sheets - "how to respond" and questions to ask yourself about content
2. Break in pairs - students cannot be with a co-worker
3. Read draft of competency goal #2 statement to partner. Take turns being reader and responder
4. Distribute REVISING CHECKLIST. After reading and gathering responses to their work, each writer makes a decision based on the choices offered of the checklist.
5. Time permitting, students can spend time drafting individually on competency goal #3. Read the context in yellow book.

6. For next class, - class will be held in the public library. The reference librarian knows the expectations of your resource collection assignment. She will be available to show you what you need - but is also on duty at the library. There may be times she needs to respond to needs of other patrons. Your goal is to find the resources for #5,6,7,and 8. The reference librarian is there to help you. You can also help eachother.

   Read through Resource Collection items #5,6,7,and 8 to make sure students know what they are looking for. Ideas for item #5 will be found with materials on the WIN shelf in the library. Items 6,7, and 8 will require a bit more "digging". Hand out some sample titles for students to look for in the card file.

CDA Resource Collection

There are17 items required to complete the Resource Collection for the CDA credential. Research skills are necessary to gather the required information. For each item, brainstorm ideas for how one might find this particular piece of information. In order to maximize the resources, students self-assign items to research and share with the reminder of the class. Some of the items, particularly # 5, 6, 7, and 8, have do be done individually. Make arrangements at a public library to research these items. The reference librarian would serve as the best resource to help to locate particular items.
Arrange the class time necessary in order to meet these needs.

Competency Statements

The 6 Competency Goal Statements are:

Competence Goal 1: Establish and maintain a safe, healthy learning environment
Competence Goal 2: Advance physical and intellectual competence
Competence Goal 3: Support social and emotional development and provide positive guidance
Competence Goal 4: Establish positive and productive relationships with families
Competence Goal 5: Ensure a well-run, purposeful program responsive to participant needs
Competence Goal 6: Maintain a commitment to professionalism

The processes developed in the first 4 classes - writing process, responding to eachother's writing, and revising - are to be applied to all the competency goal statements during the remaining classes. The available class time dictates how much can be accomplished. It was our experience that 12 to 15 weeks (meeting once a week for 2 hours) was necessary for the average student to complete the writing requirement. Some students could finish in a shorter time frame; others needed longer.

BASIC ISSUES IN CHILD CARE

Bowers, C. (1990) Organizing Space for Children. TEXAS CHILD CARE QUARTERLY. 14 (4), 3 - 11.

Fikes, C. (1989) How to Choose a Preschool Curriculum. TEXAS CHILD CARE QUARTERLY. 13 (2), 10 - 17.

Gonzalez-Mena, J. (1986) Toddlers: What to Expect. YOUNG CHILDREN. 42 (1), p. 47 - 51.

Haiman, P. (1991) Developing a Sense of Wonder in Young Children. YOUNG CHILDREN, 46, (6), 52 - 53.

Heller, E. (1988) Cognitive Activites for Infants. TEXAS CHILD CARE QUARTERLY. 12 (4), 34 - 38.

Honig, A. (1989) Quality Infant/Toddler Caregiving: Are There Magic Recipes? YOUNG CHILDREN. 44 (4), 4 - 10.

King, M. (1989) Working with Working Families. TEXAS CHILD CARE QUARTERLY. 13 (2), 3 - 8.

McLeod, A. (1991) Communicate with Infants and Their Parents. DIMENSIONS. 19 (4), 17 - 19.

Puckett, M. & Black, J. (1985) Learning to Read. DIMENSIONS. 13 (3), 15 - 18.

Schickedanz, J., Chay, S., Gopin, P., Sheng, L., Song, S., & Wild, N. (1990) Preschoolers and Academics: Some Thoughts. YOUNG CHILDREN. 46 (1), 4 - 13.

TDHS (1991) Baby Talk. TEXAS CHILD CARE QUARTERLY. 15 (3), 12 - 19.

Waldrop, C. & Scarborough, A. (1990) Crayons and Markers. DIMENSIONS. 18 (4), 15 - 18.

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION FORMS

Name______________________

CHILD CARE WORKER SCENARIO
Part 1

Nicolette was outdoors playing with a box. Jeremy liked her idea and tried to take the box away from her. Nicolette held onto the box not letting Jeremy take it away from her. The teacher saw that Jeremy and Nicolette were having a problem. The teacher said to Jeremy, "I see that Nicolette had the box first. You need to find something else to play with until she is done." Jeremy said, "NO!"

If you were the teacher in this situation, what would be your response to Jeremy? After you have written your response, bring your paper to the instructor and pick up Part 2.

WHEN A CHILD TELLS ME, “NO”?

BY DR. GRACE MITCHELL

A child who refuses to obey may just be testing her powers. Growing in independence, children need to have their feelings and ideas respected.

Dear Dr. Mitchell,

This is my third year in the teaching profession, and for the most part I feel good about what I am doing. But there is one problem that has me stymied. When a four-year-old looks me in the eye and says "No!", I don't know what to do. My inclination is to say, "Don't you talk back to me! You do as I say, and do it now!" But I know this isn't the solution. In the past week Timmy (4 1/2) refused to leave the sandbox when I announced that it was time to go in, refused to pick up the blocks he had been playing with, and refused to lie down on his cot at naptime. What kinds of positive action can I take?

Frantic Frances

Dear Frances,

You have just described one of the toughest problems a teacher faces. Of course, there is no recipe that fits every situation, but I do have some suggestions that I hope will help you and other teachers in your shoes.

Yesterday Timmy would not leave the sandbox. Are you concerned that he will be just as defiant tomorrow? How can you avert the problem?

TRY A FIVE-MINUTE WARNING

First of all, always give a five-minute warning before an activity has to end. "In five minutes it will be time to go in for lunch. Are you all as hungry as I am? Finish what you are doing so we will all be ready." The next step, if Timmy is not ready, is more direct. "I know you want to finish that tunnel, so we will all wait two more minutes, then go in together." Or you might say, "I am going to leave a note on this stick. It says, 'This is Timmy's tunnel. He will be back to finish it at 2:00 P.M. Please do not spoil it.' "

You may want to talk to Timmy alone even before going out. "Remember when we had that Tug of War? Yesterday when you wouldn't come in, I felt like that rope. It hurts to be pulled two ways. What do you think I should do about it?" *Your goals are*: first, to let him know you understand how he feels; second, to show him you also have feelings; third, to involve him in a plan of action.

TRY A POSITIVE APPROACH

A general policy which might have helped in the case of the blocks is, avoid giving orders — they just open the door for a "NO!" Start off with, "My, you built such a large castle. You used most of the blocks. I'll help you put them away. Let's see, this shape goes here. Are there any more like it?" Other children will quite likely join what looks like a fun game. (Perhaps that castle really should stay up for a day, for everyone to admire.)

As for naptime, the very words are to four- and five-year-olds what a red flag is to a bull. When you have the group together, talk about the importance of rest to growing bodies, and call this, not "naptime" but "growing time."

Try taking the older children outside for half an hour after lunch, while the younger ones are settling down. When you go in, warn them to be very careful not to wake the little ones. Let them feel older and privileged. For those who need it, allow them to look at a book as they lie on their cots, *as long as they are quiet*. If they are really tired, they will fall asleep, once they are not fighting it.

RESPECT THE INDIVIDUAL CHILD

At 4 1/2 Timmy may be testing you, or testing his own power, but there is more to it than just "How far can I go?" He is growing in his independence, and part of that growing process is a need to have his ideas and feelings respected. Most children will accept their "group" status and respond obediently, but there's always a Timmy — who is one step beyond that, who wants you to deal with him as *Timmy*, not as an anonymous part of a group.

If it seems at times necessary to make a special arrangement with one child, don't get hung up on "If I let him do that, everyone will want to." It doesn't happen that way.

While I don't like to use negatives, there is one that fits here. *Don't* ever make threats you can't enforce. Threats are not the way to solve problems, and they are apt to leave you sitting way out on the end of a very unsubstantial limb!

HAVE CONFIDENCE

But what do you do if none of my suggestions work? The hardest, and most important thing a teacher must do is acquire a strong sense of confidence. There may come a time when you have to say, "I'm sorry, Timmy, but that's the way it is going to be," and you have to *know*, way down inside you, that he will obey. Always remember, you are the teacher. A child needs the security of knowing that someone else will take the final responsibility for setting limits, not letting him go too far.

Good luck, Frances, and remember — Timmy is not the enemy, he is just a little boy, growing up!

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name____________________

Part 2

Read the attached article thinking about the situation between Jeremy and Nicolette. Would you change you first response to the situation based on what you read? Would you respond differently or the same? If you would respond differently, explain what you would change from your first response.

What is your opinion about the article that you just read? Do you agree or disagree with the information? Why?

Name____________________

What could you do to find out more about situations that involve problem solving with children?

CHILD CARE WORKER ASSESSMENT
SCORING GUIDE

Part I--Scenario Response (assesses prior knowledge of content). The student describes how they would respond to a typical problem situation in a child care setting.

Directions for scoring:

(1) The response is judged according to four criteria items.
(2) Score one point for each criteria item that is met.
(3) Student may receive a total of 4 points for this part.

Criteria:

_______ *Opportunity to Teach*-Response reflects the notion that a problem situation with a child is an opportunity to teach a child something important about appropriate social behavior rather than a time for scolding or punishment

_______ *Age Appropriateness*-Response is appropriate for the age of the child depicted in the scenario; expectations are realistic for the child's age

_______ *Child Centered*-Response encourages or invites the child to respond and/or participate in solving the problem

_______ *Concept/Content*-Response reflects an understanding of the central issue or concept involved in the situation (i.e., sharing)

Part 2 Article Response (assesses comprehension of material read in an article related to the scenario in part 1)

Directions: The student has been asked to read an article related to the problem presented in the scenario in Part I. They are then asked if they would change their original response (in Part I) based on what they read in the article. Using the same criteria from part I, the student may receive one additional point in each category if the response shows a change or addition in that category. Again, the student may receive a total of 4 points for this part.

Part 3 Opinion & Justification (assesses critical reading comprehension)

Directions: Students are not graded for their opinion but for the degree of justification they provide to support their opinion. Score as follows:

0 points--no justification
1 point--some general justification
2 points--specific justification from article and/or prior knowledge

Part 4 Knowledge of Resources

Directions: Give one point for each specific resource cited. For example, student would receive 3 points if 3 different journals are cited. There is an unlimited number of possible points for this part.

Total Score is the total points for all four sections.

CHILD CARE WORKER ASSESSMENT
SCORING SHEET

STUDENT'S NAME____________________________TEST DATE________________

CLASS_______________________________SCORER'S INITIALS_______________

CIRCLE ONE: PRE-TEST POST-TEST

PART 1 Check appropriate category: COMMENTS:

_________OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH

_________AGE APPROPRIATE

_________CHILD CENTERED

_________CONCEPT/CONTENT

_________*PART 1 TOTAL*

PART 2 Check appropriate category:

_________OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH

_________AGE APPROPRIATE

_________CHILD CENTERED

_________CONCEPT/CONTENT

_________*PART 2 TOTAL*

PART 3 Circle point value:

0 pt. NO JUSTIFICATION

1 pt. SOME GENERAL JUSTIFICATION

2pts. SPECIFIC JUSTIFICATION FROM ARTICLE
OR PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

_________*PART 3 TOTAL*

PART 4 Count number of specific resources mentioned:

_________ *PART 4 TOTAL RESOURCES MENTIONED*

______ GRAND TOTAL--ALL PARTS

Verbal Interaction Analysis **Observer**________________ **Teacher** ________________

date ________ **facility** ________________ **E** **C**

ADULT/CHILD

	Accepts feelings	Praises encourages	Accepts ideas	Asks questions	Describes	Lectures	Gives Directions	Criticizes	Explain Consequences
Time/Context									

total ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______

ADULT/ADULT

	seeks assistance	explaining	unrelated talking	silence/ confusion
Time/Context				

total ______ ______ ______ ______ ______

Categories in Interaction Analysis System*

Teacher Talk

Teacher interaction with children

Response - Indirect teacher influence

1. Accepts feelings: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the child in a nonthreatening manner; feelings may be positive or negative; predicting or recalling feelings is included; acknowledging, which includes saying hello, greetings
   Example: "That must made you feel sad."
   "Hi Sally. I'm glad you are here."

2. Praises or encourages: praises or encourages child's action or behavior; nodding head, or saying "um hm" or "go on" are included
   Example: "Thanks for helping to pick up those blocks."

3. Accepts or uses ideas of children: clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a child; as teacher brings more of her own ideas into play, shift to category number 6
   Example: "You need green paint for your picture. I will get some for you."

4. Asks questions: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a child answer
   Example: "Do you want to read a story together?"

5. Describing: narrating actions; restating what is obvious; adult describing own actions; adult describing child's actions
   Example: "I see you have a red marker."

Initiation - Direct teacher influence

6. Lecturing: giving facts or opinions about content or procedures; expressing her own ideas, asking rhetorical questions; giving information; showing
   Example: "I think you need a different lego piece to fit into that space."

7. Giving directions: directions, commands, or orders with which a child is expected to comply
   Example: "You need to wash your hands"

8. Criticizing or justifying authority: statements intended to change child's behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what she is doing, extreme self-reference
   Example: "You pick up that block right now because I said so."

9. Explaining consequences of actions: explaining why a particular behavior is appropriate or inappropriate; helping the child to see the consequences of his or her behavior
   Example: "When you pretend to be a policeman and arrest people that do not want to play, the other children might not want to play with you."

Teacher interaction with other adults

10. Seeking assistance: asking for help, support, explaining routine or expectations for the day; help with snack preparation or transitions

11. Explaining: discussions with adults clarifying child's behavior; stating observations

12. Unrelated talking: conversations between adults that do not relate to the children's activities

13. Silence or confusion: pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer

*Adapted from: Flanders, N.A. "Interaction and Analysis and Inservice Training." In H.J. Klausmeier and G.T. O'Hearn (Eds) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TOWARD THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION. Madison, WI: Dembar Educational Research Services, 1968.

Goodwin, W. & Driscoll, L. (1980)
Found in Handbook for Measurement and Evaluation in Early Childhood Education
Jossey-Bass Publ.
S. Francisco

Childcare Environment Survey

Facility____________________Teacher____________________

Observer____________________Date__________Time__________

Circle age group: Infants Toddlers PreSchool

PART ONE--LITERACY INDICATORS (each literacy indicator must be within child's eye level/range)

AREAS ⟶	**Survey Total Category**
All Age Levels:	
1. messages about the current day	
2. functional labels	
3. print or writing segments related to materials, objects, pictures nearby	
4. differents kinds of recording tools (available if not displayed)	
5. different kinds of recording materials (available if not displayed)	
6. different references (sources of information)	
7. different kinds of books	
8. books with covers or page displayed	
9. books related to nearby materials	
PreSchool Age Only:	
10. current child-written messages, labels, stories	
11. current child-dictated messages, labels, stories	
12. displayed directions for activities	
13. sign-up, sign-out charts or sheets	
14. OTHER (list on back)	
SURVEY TOTAL PER AREA	

Exp. / Cont.

Childcare Environment Survey

Facility________________________________ Teacher__________________________

Observer____________________________ Date____________ Time__________________

Circle age group: Infants Toddlers PreSchool

PART TWO--General Environment

INDICATORS:	DESCRIPTION/EXAMPLES:
1. interest areas (centers) children may choose from--list centers:	describe materials, activities for each center:
2. areas for large muscle movement --does area exist? --outdoors or indoors? --appropriately set up in classroom?	
3. separate quiet and noisy areas --space exists for child to be alone y/n --space is distraction free y/n	
4 materials/activities --represent range of difficulty --range of difficulty is appropriate	
5. environment in general conveys positive messages	
6. space invites children to do what teacher wants them to do (based on evidence of teacher planning); Y/N, if no, why?	
7. space allows teachers to see entire area; Y/N, if no, why?	
8. materials are stored close to place of use or can be easily moved	

Name______________________

Date______________

Class______________

Writing Apprehension Scale

Daly & Miller

Directions: Listed below are some statements about writing. For each statement, please circle whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are uncertain, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the statement. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements; please circle the word that best expresses your own feelings about writing. While some of these statements may seem repetitious, take your time and try to be as honest as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. I avoid writing.

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

3. I look forward to writing down my ideas

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

4. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

5. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

6. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

7. I like to write my ideas down

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

8. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

9. I like to have my friends read what I have written

   strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

10. I'm nervous about writing

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

11. People seem to enjoy what I write

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

12. I enjoy writing

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

13. I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

14. Writing is a lot of fun

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

15. I like seeing my thoughts on paper

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

16. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience

strongly agree 'agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

17. It's easy for me to write good compositions

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

18. I don't think I write as well as most other people.

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

19. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

20. I'm no good at writing

strongly agree agree am uncertain disagree strongly disagree

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Writing Interview

Please respond to the following questions:

1. Are you a good writer? Why or why not?

2. What do you do before you start to write?

3. What do you do when you come to a word you don't know how to spell?

4. What do you do when something you write doesn't make sense?

5. What do you do when you need help?

6. If you were going to help someone learn to write, what would you do to help them?

7. Name someone you know who is a good writer. What makes that person a good writer?

Child Care Giver's Cloze Test

Name

Date

Directions: Read this article and write in the words that are missing. Try to guess what word the author intended to use, not just any word that would fit.

What does it mean to "individualize" your classroom, curriculum, and your teaching methods? How can you possibly do (1) justice to so many bodies (2) all with such different needs (3)? Planning for individualization means checking (4) that all materials, equipment, and (5) the environment enhance the growth (6) of each child in your (7) room, help each succeed, and (8) challenge each to grow.

It (9) does take planning time and (10) caring,but the rewards are (11) great. Here are some concrete (12) suggestions.

Know your children well. (13) There is no better way (14) of showing that you care (15) than taking the time to (16) talk to and really listen (17) to a child. Keep their (18) special interests in mind when (19) planning the physical environment. Get (20) down to the level of (21) the children in your room, (22) and look at the environment from (23) their perspective and through their (24) eyes. Don't try to put (25) out everything at once, or arrange the entire center according to a prescribed theme. Allow for diversity of interests.

APPENDIX C

LOCAL PROMOTION OF PROJECT

WORKFORCE INSTRUCTIONAL NETWORK

Southwest Texas State University
Department of Education

Child Care Worker Instruction January 1992

The following classes will be offered through the Workforce Instructional Network at the following times and locations:

> CHILD CARE INSTRUCTION - The class is designed to answer the following question: What do we do with children, how do we do it, why do we do it, and for whom? Resources will be available for individual needs. First Baptist Church Fellowship Hall, 330 W. Hutchison St., San Marcos, 6:30 - 8:30 p.m. Class night and starting date to be determined. Please call for information and registration. Lisa Withrow, Instructor
>
> CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE CREDENTIAL - PORTFOLIO WRITING - This class is for anyone interested starting their portfolio in order to fulfill the requirements for a CDA. Assistance will be offered specifically to help with the writing process. First Baptist Church Fellowship Hall, Thursday evenings, 6:30 - 8:30, Jan 16 - March 12. Ann Johnson, Patrice Werner, Instructors.
>
> This class is also offered every other Wednesday afternoon, from 1:00 to 5:00, starting Jan. 15. Classes will be held in the Community Room at the San Marcos Public Library.
>
> CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE CREDENTIAL - ASSESSMENT: This class will be individualized for those who have completed their CDA portfolio and are preparing for the observation and assessment portion required for a CDA credential.

These classes are offered at no cost to participants. Class hours fulfill the 15 hours required by DHS for staff training. Please call Ann Johnson at 245-8187 for further information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Child care workers get 'stamp of approval' through training programs

By SUSAN HANSON
Staff Writer

Who is caring for the nation's children? In 1988, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, just over nine million children, age five and under, were being cared for outside of their homes. And of this number, over four million were enrolled in a day care or preschool program.

What sort of training is required of the people who work in these programs? Standards vary from state to state, but at present, Texas requires only two things of its child care workers: They must be 18 years of age, and they must have at least a high school diploma or GED.

In addition, the preschool itself must meet certain minimum standards set by the Texas Department of Human Services, including a requirement that each worker receive 15 clock hours of training per year.

"I think any child care worker will say that it helps to have more than that," says Ann Johnson, coordinator of educational services with the Workforce Instructional Network (WIN)

As Johnson admits, many child care workers have preparation well beyond the minimum, but for those who don't, the opportunities for training are often limited.

It was with these individuals in mind, she says, that WIN developed a special program last fall for child care workers in San Marcos.

A partnership between Southwest Texas State University, the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce, and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, WIN is a project of the university's Center for Initiatives in Education, which is directed by Margaret E. Dunn. The original proposal for the Workforce Instructional Network was developed by David Caverly and Pam McBride in conjunction with Jon Engel and other community educators.

"What we're offering is intended to make child care workers more independent and to help them gain knowledge that will make them more effective," says Johnson. "We want them to realize that what they're doing is a profession and to see what that means."

In addition to developing greater self-confidence and learning skills that they can use in the classroom, participants in the program also have the opportunity to work toward their certification as Child Development Associates.

Developed in 1974, the CDA program was a response to the growing national concern over the qualifications and abilities of child care personnel. Since 1975, when the first credential was awarded, over 30,000 child care workers have successfully completed the program.

Although it is now recognized in 42 states as a valid indicator of a child care worker's competence, Ann Johnson believes that the CDA credential will ultimately become a mandatory requirement for licensing.

"Starting in 1995," she says, "the state of Florida will require one Child Development Associate for every 20 children. That's quite a step."

In offering personnel from local child care centers the opportunity to work toward this credential now, Johnson maintains, WIN is preparing them for inevitable changes in the profession.

How did WIN become involved in this effort to certify child care workers in San Marcos? As WIN project director Jon Engel explains, it was Ann Johnson who played the crucial role of liaison between the local child care center directors and the WIN program.

From her experience as director of the Presbyterian Cooperative Preschool, Johnson was quite familiar with the needs and concerns of local directors. For over three years, those directors had been meeting with one another on an informal basis, using the time to exchange ideas and to offer support. But they were limited in what they could offer their staffs in terms of training.

At the same time, Johnson recalls, the WIN program had begun holding worksite-based literacy classes and had discovered a problem: Who would care for the participants' children while the parents were in class?

"That's when David (Caverly) and Pam (McBride) approached me," Johnson says. It was also at this point that Johnson suggested offering some sort of training to the child care workers as well.

Ultimately, the need for such a program was confirmed both by David Caverly and Margaret Dunn, who discussed the issue with numerous people in the community, and by the center directors themselves.

The result? The first WIN class for local child care workers was begun on Sept. 23, with approximately 20 participants completing the 11-week course.

"It taught me more about children," says Rosa Hernandez, a child care worker at First Baptist Church's Child Development Center. "It taught me about lesson planning and about children getting along with each other."

The mother of five children, ranging age from two to 11, Hernandez says that what she learned through the WIN program has been helpful at home as well.

Although Hernandez successfully completed her course last

(See Child Care, page 2B)

(Continued from page 1B)

fall, she has decided to continue in the WIN program and work toward her accreditation as a Child Development Associate.

As Jon Engel explains, the goals of the CDA program are quite compatible with the goals of WIN— to promote adult literacy in the workplace. Indeed, he says, the credential has become a motivator for many of the child care workers participating in the WIN program.

What must a child care worker do to be certified? According to Johnson, candidates must not only prove themselves in the classroom, but they must also prepare a portfolio documenting their skills.

It is in this second area, she notes, that the candidates typically need the most help.

During their class time together, the child care workers normally exchange ideas, discuss their strategies in the classroom, and learn how to put those ideas on paper.

"In my experience in working with adults, I've learned that writing scares them," says Jon Engel. "It's a difficult process to master, and they often don't believe they can do it."

"The class is a support for that," says early childhood specialist Patrice Werner, an assistant professor in curriculum and instruction at SWT. "We try to help the participants feel comfortable with writing and help them support each other. They do a lot of working together, sharing what they've written.

"What we've tried to do is design a process to enable all of that to happen," she says, noting that the course emphasizes brainstorming, writing, and editing as separate steps in completing a paper. "We've really worked on the *process*. It's been exciting."

What impact has the program had thus far? "I realized I *can* do it," says Rosa Hernandez. "It's not as hard as it sounds."

"It has seemed to be a kind of empowering thing," Werner adds. "When the class began, the students had to write autobiographies and explain why they're interested in doing this. One of the things that came out frequently was 'I want to do this for me. I want to accomplish something.'

"One person said, 'It's like getting a stamp of approval on me and saying what I do is worthwhile.'"

As the director of First Baptist Church's Child Development Center, Judy Glover says that she, too, has noticed a number of changes in the last several months.

"I've seen a whole different attitude in the way people approach their job and in their confidence," she explains. "It's letting our people feel that they are doing a worthwhile thing. Our people know that they're more than custodial care givers, that they have meaning in the children's lives."

Explaining that participants are evaluated both before and after taking the course, instructor Lisa Withrow says that the differences are often quite impressive. "So many things changed," she says, noting that the observer considers not only the interaction between teacher and child, but also the arrangement and atmosphere of the room itself.

"I think this program affects more than the participants," she adds. "It improves the education process through the whole family."

Thus far, Jon Engel says, over 40 workers from six local day care centers— including Headstart, SWT's Child Development Center, First Baptist Church's Child Development Center, and the day care center at San Marcos High School— have been through some aspect of the WIN program.

At present, he adds, classes are being held from 1-5 p.m. every other Wednesday at the San Marcos Public Library and from 6:30-8:30 p.m. on Thursdays at the First Baptist Church.

A third class, set to begin on Feb. 20, will meet from 6:30-8:30 p.m. on Thursdays at the San Marcos Public Library.

For more information about upcoming classes, or about any other aspect of the WIN program, call Jon Engel at 245-8142.

Selected Bibliography

WORKFORCE SKILLS

Adult literacy: Helping Americans with midlevel skills prepare for the high-level demands of tomorrow (1989). ETS Developments. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 308 473)

America and the New Economy, *Business Council for Effective Literacy, No. 28,* (1991, July), 1,6.

America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages. Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Benton. L. & Noyelle T. (1992). *Adult illiteracy and economic performance.* Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Bernardon, N. (1989, January). Let's erase illiteracy from the workplace. *Personnel, 66,* 29-32.

Bernstein, A. (1988, September 19). Where the jobs are is where the skills aren't. *Business Week,* 104-108.

Bush, K. (1991, March). *Workplace literacy programs at North Harris County College.* Presentation at the meeting of the Rural Capital Area Community Partnerships for Literacy, Round Rock, TX.

Carnevale, A., Gaines, L., & Meltzer, A. (1990). *Workplace Basics Training Manual.* A publication of the American Society for Training and Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Carr, Kathryn S. (1990). *Literacy in the workplace: A whole language approach.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324 441)

Census Tracks; Austin, TX: Standard Metropolitan Statistical area 1980 Census of population and housing (1983). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Copple, Carlo. (1991). QUALITY MATTERS: Improving the Professional Development of the Early Childhood Work Force. National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development. NAECY. Washington D.C.

Crosby, P. (1979). *Quality is free: The art of making quality certain.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dreyfuss, J. (1990). The three R's on the shop floor: reading, writing, and work skills. *Fortune, 12,* 86-89.

Dunn-Rankin, P., & Beil, D. (1989). *Workplace literacy programs: A review of the literature.* Honolulu, HI: Hawaiian Educational Council, Inc.

Federal Register, Vol. 54, No. 159, 34,418 - 34,421.

Feuer, D. (1987, December). The skill gap: America's crisis of competence. *Training*, 27-35.

Garland, S. B., Therrien, L., & Hammonds, K. H. (1988, September 19). Why the underclass can't get out from under. *Business Week*, 122-124.

Harwood, R. (1989). *Closing the gap: Meeting the small business training challenge in Connecticut.* A Jobs for the Future, Inc. Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 867)

Herschback, D. R. (1988). *Linking with employment: Training from the perspective of employers.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 303 623)

Hugh, S. & Quesada, E. (1990). Everyone wins in partnership: Weber Metals, Inc., the Paramont School District and, especially, the Weber employees. *Personnel Journal, 69* (10), 69-71.

Hurst, J. (1988, Summer). Concern grows over workplace literacy. *Training Trends*, TPC Training Systems.

Johnston, W. & Packer, A. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century.* Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Jurmo, P., Wiggenhorn, B., Packer, A., & Zeigler, W. (1989, January). How can businesses fight workplace illiteracy? *Training and Development Journal*, 18-24.

Kerka, S. (1990). *Job-related basic skills, ERIC Digest No. 94.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 912)

Kotkin, J. (1990, January). The skills crisis. *Inc.*, 28.

Literacy begins at home (1989, April). *Business Council for Effective Literacy, 19*, 1-6.

Lohr, S. (1992,April 26). The global economy's engines are out of tune and sputtering. Week in Review, *New York Times* .

May, P. (1990). Back to basics. *Personnel Journal, 69* (10), 63-69.

McKenna, J. F. (1990, January 8). A little learning is a dangerous thing. *Industry Week*, 74-78.

Mikulecky, L. & Diehl, W. (1980). *Job literacy: A study of literacy demands, attitudes, and skills in a cross-section of occupations.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, School of Education.

Mikulecky, L. (1988). *Literacy for the workplace.* Indiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 294 164)

Mikulecky, L., & Ehlinger, J. (1986). The influence of metacognitive aspects of literacy on job performance of electronics technicians. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 18* (1), 41-62.

National Alliance of Business (1987). *The Fourth R. Workplace Readiness.* Washington, D.C.: National Alliance of Business.

Nussbaum, B. (1988, September 19). Needed: Human capital. *Business Week*, 100-103 .

Peters, T. (1987). *Prescriptions for a world turned upside down. Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a management revolution* (pp. 3-45). New York: Alfred A.Knopf.

Reich, R. B. (1991). *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism,*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Ritter, A. (1990, February). Training wheels are turning. *Personnel,* 6-7.

Ronin, D. (1989). *R_X for Texas: Staying in Business in the 90's.* Dallas: Taylor Publishing Company.

Rutherford, B. (1989). The basic skills gap:Whose problem, whose solution? *Public Utility Forum,124,*13-17.

Sherman, E. (1989, July). Back to basics to improve skills. *Personnel,* 22-26

Skagen, A. (1986). *Workplace literacy.* New York: American Management Association.

State of the State: Report Card Gives Texas Work Force Failing Grade, *Texas Business Today,* (1991, September) 1,3.

Talking Heads: Issues and Challenges in Adult Literacy, *Business Council for Effective Literacy, No. 30,* (1992, January), 1,6

Taylor, M. C., Lewe, G. R., & Draper, J. A. (1991). *Basic skills for the workplace.* Toronto, Ontario: Culture Concepts Inc.

Texas Business Today (1988, November). *Results: Literacy Opinion Poll.* Austin, TX: Texas Employment Commission .

Texas Employment Commission (1988, August). *Texas Jobs 1995, Employment by Industry and Occupation.* Texas Employment Commission, Economic Research and Analysis Department.

Texas Employment Commission (1989, April). Businesses face new challenges as changing workforce emerges. *Texas Business Today,* 1-2.

Texas Workforce 2000 (n.d.). Austin, TX: Texas Employment Commission.

The large matter of small business (1990, July). *Business Council for Effective Literacy, 24,* 1-8.

The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (1991, June). *What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000.* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Labor.

Tooley, J., & Bernstein, A. (1990). Measures of change. *U.S. News and World Report, 107-25,* 66-67.

Tools of the trade (1990, January). *Business Council for Effective Literacy, 22,* 5.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, (1992, May). *Adult Learning and Literacy: Workplace Literacy: Reshaping the American Workforce.*

U.S. Department of Labor: Employment and Training Administration, (1990). *The School-To-Work Connection.* Washington D. C.

U.S. Small Business Administration (1988). *Workplace literacy: Targeting the future. A report on the national conference on literacy.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 300 671).

Wagner, L., (1990, October), America's Choice: High Skills, *Business Council for Effective Literacy, No. 25,* 1,6.

Whitman, D., Shapiro, J., Taylor, E., Saltzman, A., & Auster, B. (1989, June, 26). The forgotten half. *U.S. News and World Report, 106-25,* 45-53.

Workforce 2000 (1991). *A National Teleconference and Outreach Initiative On Improving America's Work Skills.*

Zemke, R. (1989, June). Workplace illiteracy: Shall we overcome? *Training*, 33-39.

BACKGROUND THEORY

Barrows, D. S. & Morris, S. (1989). Managing public policy issues, *Long Range Planning,22,* (6) 66 -73.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Womens Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind.*

Birkey, C. J. M. (1984). Future directions for adult education and adult educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35* (3), 25-29.

Blai, B., Jr. (1989). *Literacy quality of life in the United States.* Pennsylvanla. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 817)

Boone, E., Shearon, R., White, E., & Associates (1980). *Serving personal and community needs through adult education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boutwell, Marilyn. (1989). Partnership for Change. In A. Fingeret & P. Jurmo (Eds.) *Participatory Literacy Education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 42.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burnstein, L.H., Freeman, H.E., & Rossi, P.H. (Eds.) (1985). *Collecting evaluation data: Problems and solutions.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Castelli, J. (1989). How to close tomorrow's literacy gap. *Safety and Health, 140,* 54-57.

Caverly, D. C., Burrell, K., Wedig, L., & Austin, M. (1992, April). Developmental education for a diverse workforce. Paper presented at Twenty-Fifth annual national conference of the College Reading and Learning Association, San Francisco.

Chisman, F. P. (1989). *Jump start: The federal role in adult literacy.* Washington, DC: The Southport Institute.

Chisman, F. P. (1990). *Leadership for literacy: The agenda for the 1990's.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chisman, F.P. (1992). *The Missing Link: Workplace Education in Small Business.* The Southport Institute for Policy Analysis.

Collino, G. E., Aderman, E. M., & Askov, E. N. (1988). *Literacy and job performance: A perspective.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University . (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 617)

Cook, W. (1977). *Adult literacy education in the United States.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Costa, M. (1988). *Adult literacy/illiteracy in the United States.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABS-Clio.

Educational Data Systems, Inc. (1989, April). What's the fuss about literacy? *Outlook,* Dearborn, MI: Educational Data Systems, Inc.

Ehrlich, E. (1988, September 19). America's schools still aren't making the grade. *Business Week,* 129-135.

Freeman, H. E., & Rossi, P. H. (1985). *Evaluations: A systematic approach.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

French, J. (1987). *Adult literacy: A source book and guide.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Greenberg, E. R. (1989, September). Some pointers on basic training techniques. *Personnel,* 22-26.

Haley, A. (1990, September 2). Why reading matters. *Parade Magazine,* 28-30.

Harman, D. (1987). *Illiteracy: A national dilemma.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Irwin, P. M. (1988). *Adult literacy issues, programs, and options. Updated.* Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse on Adult Education and Literacy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 794)

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach.* Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

Lee, C. (1987, November). Educators of last resort. *Training*, 8.

Literacy Volunteers of America (n.d.). *Facts on illiteracy in America.* Syracuse, NY: Literacy Volunteers of America.

Long, H. B. (1982). *Theoretical foundations of adult education: Borrowings from other disciplines. Theory, innovation, and practice in andragogy, No. 3.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 463)

Lytle, S., Belzer, A., Schultz, K., & Vannozzi, M. (1989). Learner centered literacy assessment: An evolving process. In A. Fingeret & P. Jurmo (Eds.) *Participatory Literacy Education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 42.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lytle, S. L. (1992, January). Living literacy: Rethinking development in adulthood. *Linguistics and Education* .

Metfessel, N. S., & Michael, W. B. (1967). A paradigm involving multiple criterion measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of school programs. *Evaluation and Psychological Measurement, 27,* 931-943.

Mikulecky, L. (1987). The status of literacy in our society. In J.E. Readence & R.S. Baldwin (Eds.) *Research in Literacy: Merging perspectives* (pp. 211-235). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Mosenthal, P. B., & Mosenthal, I. S. (1991). Mimetic dicuments: Process schematics. *Journal of Reading, 34, (5), 390-397.*

Murphy, Jr. Clennie, and Wazler, Trellis (1981) Head Start: A Brief Review and Preview. The Journal of Negro Education. Vol. 58, No. 1, Winter 1989, p. 1-4.

Newman, A. (1980). *Adult basic education: Reading.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Northcutt, N. (1975). Functional literacy for adults. In D. M. Nielson & H. J. Hjelm (Eds.) *Reading and Career Education* (pp. 43-49). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Phillips, Deborah, Editor, (1987) QUALITY IN CHILD CARE: What Does Research Tell Us? NAEYC, Washington, D.C.

Rush, R., Moe, A., & Storlie, R. (1986). *Occupational literacy education.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Slavin, R. (1987). Cooperative learning and the cooperative school. *Educational Leadership, 44,* 7-13.

Stedman, L. C., & Kaestle, C. F. (1987). Literacy and reading performance in the United States from 1880 to the present. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22,* 8-46.

Stein, M. (1988). Combining literacy and computer training. *Editor & Publisher, the Fourth Estate, 121*, 28.

Sticht, T. G. (1987) *Functional context education: Workshop resource notebook.* San Diego, CA: Applied Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences, Inc.

Sticht, T.G.(1989). *Functional context education: Policy and training methods from the military experience.* Background paper No. 41. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 710)

Strumpf, Lori, (1991, October), What Makes This Hard? Workplace Literacy and Functional Context Instruction, *Mosaic: Research Notes on Literacy, Vol. 1, No. 2,* Penn. State, 1-2, 6.

Texas Employment Commission (1992) Family Issues Dominate Workplace and Employee Benefits Discussions. *Texas Business Today.* Sept. 1992.

Trueba, H. T. (1990). The role of culture in literacy acquisition: An interdisciplinary approach to qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.*

U.S. Dept. of Education (1986). *Adult illiteracy estimates for States.* Washington, DC.

Whyte, W. F. (1991). *Participatory Action Research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

PRACTITIONER RESOURCE

Bova, B. M. & Phillips, R. R. (1984). Mentoring as a learning experience for adults. *Journal of Teacher Education, 3* (3), 16-20.

Daly, J.A., &Miller, M. D. (1975a). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 242-249.*

Derry, S. J. (1984). *Strategy training: An incidental learning model for CAI.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 884)

Drew, R. A., & Mikulecky, L. (1988). *How to gather and develop job-specific literacy materials for basic skills instruction: A practitioner's Guide.* Bloomington, IN: School of Education, Office of Education and Training Resources, Indiana University: Bloomington.

Fingeret, A. & Jurmo, P. (1989). *Participatory literacy education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 42.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hadley Press Catalog: Adult Placement Indicator (API), (1992 - 1993).

Hayes, E. (1988). A typology of low literate adults based on perceptions of deterrents to participation in adult basic education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 39,* 1-10.

Job-related basic skills : A guide for planners of employee programs (1988). New York, NY: Business Council for Effective Literacy.

Jurmo, P. (in press) *A Team Approach to Evaluation and Planning: A Handbook for Workplace Educators in a Changing Workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaplan, E. (1984). *Life skills writing 2 for the world of work.* New York: Educational Design, Inc.

McBride, P. (1990). Developing a generalized workplace literacy curriculum. In *Proceedings from the Literacy in Community Conference.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press.

Phillips, Deborah, Editor (1991) ESSENTIALS. Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition. NAEYC, Washington, D.C.

Philippi, J. W. (1988). *Lessons learned about workplace literacy from military job-specific reading programs.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, Toronto, Canada, May 1-6.

Rural Capital Area Private Industry Council (1991, March). *Examples of "literacy partnership."* Round Rock, TX: Rural Capital Area Community Partnership for Literacy Conference.

Sarmiento, A. R. and Kay, A. (1990). *Worker centered learning: A union guide to workplace literacy.* Washington, DC: AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute.

Shrilling. D. (1989). Program evaluation as a strategy for program improvement in adult basic education. *Lifelong Learning, 12,* 23-24.

Soifer, R, Irwin, M. E., Crumrine, B. M., Honzaki, E., Simmons, B. K., & Young, D. L. (1990). *The complete theory-to-practice handbook of adult literacy.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Soifer, R, Young, D. L., & Irwin, M. (1989). The academy: A learner-centered workplace literacy program. In A. Fingeret & P. Jurmo (Eds.) *Participatory Literacy Education; New Directions for Continuing Education (No. 42)* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

UAW-Ford National Education Development and Training Center (1988). *Mastering the Elements, the Story of the UAW-Ford Skills Enhancement Program.*

Walker, B. J. (1988). *Diagnostic Teaching of Reading: Techniques for Instruction and Assessment,* Columbus, OH: Merril Publishing Company.

SWT
Center for Initiatives in Education
School of Education
Southwest Texas State University
A Member of the Texas State University System